

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1869.

---

ART. I.—*An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.*

By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D. of the University of Halle,  
and LL.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 1868.

THIS is the most advanced work that has yet appeared in England of the Party which has assumed the title of the School of High Criticism. We think the term an unfortunate one, as it is certainly one which is exceedingly ambiguous. We are familiar with two forms of this expression, high art and high play. We confess that the performances of the school of high criticism bear a closer affinity to the latter than the former. As the chief instrument of the one is chance, so that of the other is conjecture. As the high player stakes the whole of his fortunes on a cast of the dice, so the high critic would have us stake our belief in Christianity on his facility at the work of happy guessing. The importance of Dr. Davidson's work is great. It contains a vast mass of matter. The number of German authorities referred to is enormous; and if the author has read them all, he must be a man of unquestionable erudition. Dr. Davidson's style, however, is heavy, and his manner intensely dogmatical. His logical powers bear no proportion to the extent of his erudition; and his judgment is utterly at fault. We are much struck with Dr. Davidson's dogmatic spirit. We think that in this respect he would not be a bad rival of the Pope. Instead of giving us sound reasonings, he is ever endeavouring to confound us by the weight of his authorities. The Schoolmen could have hardly had a greater reverence for Aristotle, than he has for his own infallibility, and that of the German school of high criticism.

We feel a great responsibility in reviewing this work. It deeply affects our belief in Christianity itself. Dr. Davidson still clings to a belief of some kind in its Divine character. But he subverts our trust in the credibility of the records, in which our entire knowledge of it is contained. This will be apparent when we inform our readers of the nature of the results to which his criticism has conducted him.

First: neither of the four Gospels was written by the person to whom it has been ascribed. Secondly: they date respectively about as late as the years 100, 110, 120 and 150. Thirdly: even the three Synoptics contain a considerable number of unhistorical narratives and events, and have been composed by persons who have more or less distorted the facts for party purposes, and have invented others. Fourthly: the Gospel according to St. John is almost entirely unhistorical. Fifthly: the Acts of the Apostles has a very small amount of matter in it which is really trustworthy, and the author has framed it with the intention of reconciling Petrine and Pauline Christianity; or, to use plain words, although he is the author of the third Gospel, whenever he did not find suitable materials he forged them. Sixthly: the only genuine writings in the New Testament are the two epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, two to the Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Jude, and the Book of Revelation. Seventhly: the other epistles ascribed to St. Paul are the work of a much later age, or, to speak plainly, are forgeries; and the epistle to the Hebrews is also a late production. Eighthly: the first epistle of St. Peter is not the work of the Apostle, but of some Christian who wished to place Pauline doctrines in the mouth of the leader of Jewish Christianity; and the epistle of St. James, though essentially Jewish in its aspect, yet presents us with Jewish Christianity in a second stage of its development, and that the second of St. Peter, and second and third of John, are neither genuine nor apostolic. Lastly, though not least, in the audacity of its assertion, that the first epistle of St. John is not the work of the Apostle; and although external evidence is strong in its favour, it can be proved by internal evidence alone, not to have been written by even the author of the Fourth Gospel. Such is a brief view of the contents of the volumes before us. We owe it to our readers to give positive proof of the position which we assume, that whatever may be the amount of Dr. Davidson's erudition, it is rendered useless by an entire absence of the power of logical reasoning and sound judgment.



As our space is limited, we shall not attempt to trace the phases through which the author's mind has passed; or to point out the nature of the ultimate landing-place where his principles must conduct him. It is our intention to deal with Dr. Davidson solely as a reasoner. As he has done his best to destroy the belief of what, in our point of view, is the foundation of Christianity, we must plead lack of room as our reason for not doing what we would willingly in the first place do, viz. notice favourably the more commendable portions of the work before us. We feel, however, that it is no time for using honeyed words. As we wish to give Dr. Davidson credit for all sincerity, we feel assured that he will forgive us for calling a spade a spade, when we examine his competency for executing the work which he has undertaken.

Two qualifications are necessary for composing a work such as that before us—erudition, which we concede to him; and a sound logical judgment, the possession of which we utterly deny him. We confess that his logic has sorely tried our patience. It is our intention, therefore, not to wander over the whole of Dr. Davidson's work, but to confine our criticisms to certain portions of it, for the purpose of enabling our readers to form a distinct opinion of the unsoundness of his powers of judgment, and his inability to appreciate evidence. For this purpose we shall frequently assume Dr. Davidson's standing-point, and not our own, in relation to the sacred writings. We wish our readers clearly to understand that we shall not always express our own views of their inspiration or their teaching; but reason on those furnished us by the author.

Our readers should be informed that Dr. Davidson belongs to the school which asserts that the historical documents of the New Testament have assumed their present form under the influence of opposing schools of thought, which they assure us existed in the Primitive Church. The two most prominent of these were a Petrine and a Pauline party, who held very divergent views as to what constituted the essence of Christianity. The first may be not inaptly described as the School of Jewish, the second as that of Gentile, Christianity, which gradually imparted to it the spirit of universalism which characterises our present New Testament. The present form of the facts of the evangelical history, of the teaching of our Lord, and of the doctrinal statements of the New Testament, have developed themselves out of certain tendencies of thought which have led to various distortions of the original facts; and in many instances to the introduction of others, which are purely mythic. For example; the author of the Third Gospel

and the Acts was a man who laboured hard to reconcile Petrine and Pauline Christianity. Under the influence of this feeling he shaped his statements of facts; where it was necessary for his purpose, he did not hesitate to distort them, and when they did not exist, to invent them. This our author declares to be pre-eminently the case with the Acts of the Apostles. The larger portion of its discourses are not those of Peter or Paul, but have been composed by the writer for the purpose of reconciling the two contending parties in the Church. The statements of fact likewise have been coloured, or even invented in some cases, with this object in view. The Gospel which is believed in by this school may therefore not incorrectly be designated as *the Gospel according to the Tendencies*.

To give such views the semblance of probability, it is absolutely necessary that a very late date should be assigned for the composition of our present historical books. Accordingly our author assigns their date proximately as follows: Matthew A.D. 100, Luke 115, Mark 120, Acts 125, John 150. For these dates we have failed to find any reliable evidence in these volumes. The author makes no real attempt to prove them. The only attempt to argue the question is the assertion, that these tendencies can be found in the structural of the Gospels and Acts respectively; and it is impossible that they could have developed themselves in the form in which we find them at an earlier date. Dr. Davidson also discusses the references to them in the early Fathers; but he makes no attempt to show if these books were composed at so late a date, that it was possible that they could have obtained the currency in the Church which these quotations and references imply, or that they could have been attributed to the authors whose names they bear. He notices the difficulty with respect to St. Mark's Gospel, but leaves it unsolved. As these late dates are the key-stone of Dr. Davidson's position, it is necessary that they should not be assumed, but demonstrated, and the evidence to the contrary shown to be untenable. This we submit that Dr. Davidson has utterly failed to accomplish.

We are quite ready to concede the oral character of the original Gospel; or, to speak more accurately, that after a very short lapse of time, it was partly oral and partly written in the form of memoranda, and that this forms the basis of the Synoptics. This is the only possible account which can be given of the very singular agreements and disagreements in the verbal expressions which they present; and to it their entire phenomena—which can only be appreciated after a most careful study—point. The first teachers of Christianity must

have supplied their converts with an outline of our Lord's actions and teaching; for without one of some kind it could not exist. This in the course of time was committed to writing by the authors of our present Gospels. They were composed out of the oral teaching of the different churches, and from memoranda which different converts had composed for their private use.

Dr. Davidson is of opinion, that the authors of the Synoptic Gospels borrowed from one another; and that Mark and Luke made free use of Matthew's Gospel. His language on this point is strong: "Those who believe in the original independence of the Evangelists—that each wrote without seeing what his predecessor had composed—have been fairly driven out of the field of criticism. One valid argument overturns their belief, viz. the peculiar resemblance of Mark's Gospel to that of Matthew."

Dr. Davidson forgets the salutary advice which recommends one who is girding on his armour, not to boast himself like him who takes it off. We utterly deny the assertion that those who believe that the Synoptics were composed independently of each other, have been driven from the field of criticism. We have compared every portion of the parallel narrative, and have arrived at the conclusion, that it is impossible that St. Mark and St. Luke could have written as they have if they had had St. Matthew's Gospel before them. If we compare St. Matthew and St. Mark's Gospels, what are the characteristics which at once strike the reader? Some portions present a remarkable coincidence in words and phrases, which most unquestionably have originated in a source common to both writers. At the same time they are distinguished by verbal diversity of a most peculiar character. It is utterly incredible, if St. Mark had Matthew's Gospel before him, that he should have made these alterations of grammar, arrangement, and omission of which we speak, for most of them are of a most arbitrary character, and serve no conceivable purpose. But there is another consideration which is conclusive against the idea that the author of Mark composed his Gospel with that of Matthew in his hands, unless he composed his own with very dishonest purposes. The most remarkable difference between the narrative portions of these Gospels is, that whereas those of Matthew are the barest narratives of events, those of Mark introduce into them a large amount of the liveliest description, such as usually distinguishes ocular testimony. If, therefore, Mark had Matthew's narrative before him, the whole of these pecu-

liarities must have been deliberately invented by him, and foisted into his own. Dr. Davidson somewhere observes that one man has a more lively style than another. We grant this; but that has nothing to do with the present question. The peculiarities of St. Mark are those which usually accompany ocular testimony. The question before us is not one about a more or less lively style; but the honesty of the procedure of one who had a narrative before him of the character of Matthew, and who interpolated into it the peculiar traits with which Mark's Gospel abounds. We invite Dr. Davidson to take a narrative of events written in the style of Matthew, and recompose it in that of Mark, preserving the same number of identical expressions. To publish such an interpolated narrative as an original, would involve an amount of dishonesty, of which we cannot suspect Dr. Davidson to be capable; and, therefore, we cannot believe it of the author of St. Mark's Gospel.

Dr. Davidson does his best to prove that the reference to Mark's Gospel in the celebrated fragment of Papias, preserved by Eusebius, must refer to a prior Mark, instead of the Gospel which now bears his name, and for which it has been cunningly substituted. But he is by no means insensible to the difficulty with which it must have been attended in the short interval during which, if the substitution was really made, it must have taken place. The following is his account of the matter: "This transference seems to have been effected silently, without the observation or the opposition which it would have elicited in a critical age. It must be admitted that there is no proper historical trace of such substitution, and that the Fathers speak only of the present Gospel of St. Mark."\*

Now this is a very quiet way of assuming the point at issue. It is admitted that the Fathers knew of our present Mark, and do not afford a trace of the existence of any other; and yet, that a genuine Mark had been in existence, and well known only a few years previously, for which our present Mark has been substituted. Yet Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, who were separated by a single generation from the Apostles, and the latter of whom tells us that he had a most lively recollection of hearing Polycarp, who had conversed with John, not only believed our present Mark to be the genuine one, but had never heard of the real Mark, though in circulation only a few years before. This is the most extravagant of

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 82.

suppositions. Eusebius also, who quotes the passage from Papius, had not the smallest idea that it was inapplicable to our present Mark. Compared with the improbability, nay, the impossibility, of the supposition which Dr. Davidson adopts, the difficulty as to whether the words *ἐν ταῖς* are applicable to the present Gospel is as nothing. It is even far more probable that John the Presbyter was deceived in his statement, than that a false Mark could have been substituted for the genuine one in the manner supposed.

We grieve to see that Dr. Davidson can have recourse to the following most unworthy subterfuge, and insinuate that there is some doubt whether the four Gospels which Irenæus had in his hands were our four received ones, and that one of them was Mark. "It may be answered," says he, "that Irenæus, though well acquainted with the four Gospels, does not call the second a Gospel, but what was preached by Peter." Does Dr. Davidson mean to insinuate, after what he has conceded, that Irenæus doubted whether his second Gospel was a Gospel, or that it was Mark's? or, that Irenæus did not plainly assert that there must have been four Gospels, and could have been no more? His argument on this point may be worthless enough, but it could not even have been thought of unless four Gospels had long been current in and acknowledged by the Church. We forbear to comment further on this passage.

Our author treats with the utmost contempt the general tradition that the Apostle Peter was in some way connected with the composition of our present Gospel, although he admits that Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria assert it. He says that Peter's connection was with the lost, and not the present Mark, and that some passages of the lost one may have been introduced into our present Gospel. Now all this is mere hypothesis and guess work, founded on the uncertain interpretation of a small fragment of a work which has perished. Pure conjecture is placed before us with the certainty of an oracle.

But our author is conscious of the weakness of the foundation on which his theory rests; and, therefore, he endeavours to bolster it up by some weak appeals "to internal testimony." "Our present Mark," says he, "is not copious or remarkable in particulars relating to Peter." Our author is well acquainted with the reasons which have been assigned for this; and which not only explain the cause of the omission, but constitute a most satisfactory reason for believing that the connection of the author of the Gospel with St. Peter was a real one. Dr. Davidson says that "these reasons might have had some

weight if Mark had written while Peter was alive." But why should they not have operated on Mark after Peter was dead? If Peter suppressed them from modesty, and Mark entertained a reverential regard for him, why might he not have carried out his known wishes? It is the exception and not the rule to disregard them.

But Dr. Davidson, in common with this school of thought, catches at a straw which seems to support their theories, and quietly ignores all the evidence which makes against them. We have closely examined St. Mark's Gospel, and beg to draw attention to the fact, that it is nearly always the case that whenever we can prove that Peter was present at an event, either from this or either of the other Gospels, this Gospel contains a peculiarly graphic description of it, precisely of the style which we should have expected from a man of his peculiar temperament. This is the case with every event at which Peter can be identified as being present, up to the time when he enters the High Priest's palace; and then a very satisfactory reason can be given for the graphic style of narrative breaking off at this particular point. If this is the case, it affords the strongest confirmation of the tradition that Peter was in some way or other connected with the author of this Gospel. Why has Dr. Davidson left this circumstance wholly unnoticed?

Our author supports his opinion that Mark used Matthew largely, by quoting passages from both Gospels, where the words in one nearly coincide with those in the other. He even contends that there are passages in Mark which are made up by a union of Matthew and Luke. For this purpose he adduces the Parable of the Sower, the narrative of bringing little children to Christ, and the cleansing of the leper. We invite him greatly to enlarge this list, and to point out on what principle the minute verbal alterations have been introduced, which his theory presupposes to have been inserted with a deliberate design; and especially we draw his attention to the Parable of the Husbandman, and ask him to explain to us the principle on which either of the Evangelists could have framed his narrative out of either of the other two, unless he has deliberately done so, for the sake of imposing on his readers, and persuading them of his originality when he was only a copyist. These variations and agreements in expression are more peculiar than any in the Gospels, and it would occupy several pages if we were to point the whole of them out. If made on purpose, they are most capricious and unaccountable.



If the Parable of the Sower in Mark has been borrowed from that of Matthew, it is evident that the author must have had the whole of Matthew xiii. before him. In this case a difficulty at once meets us, which Dr. Davidson quietly passes over in silence. Matthew xiii. contains seven parables. Mark iv. has three only, two of which are common with Matthew, and one, viz. of the seed, growing a man knows not how, peculiar to Mark. Now, we ask, what reason can be assigned for Mark's relating two of Matthew's parables, and inserting an altered version of them in his Gospel, the variations being of the most singular description; omitting the other five, and instead of these inserting a parable nowhere else found in the Gospels? But this is not all. Matthew xiii. contains the reasons why our Lord spake to the multitude in parables. These reasons in Mark are altered, abridged, and enlarged in a singular manner, and divided into two portions, separated from each other by the insertion of the explanation of the Parable of the Sower. We invite the author to give a rational account of these phenomena which will be consistent with his theory. He has given us a reason why Mark inserted the words, "Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables?" "We can discern here a tendency to ascribe to our Lord an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine." But he must give a rational account of the whole phenomena, not only of this, but of many other parallel passages; and until he has done so, we assert that there is no logical connection between his premisses and his conclusions.

We are desirous of hastening onwards, but it is our misfortune not to be able to turn over the pages of this work without having our attention drawn aside by reasonings of a most fallacious character. A few pages farther on our eye has alighted on the following passages, which are certainly sublimely dogmatical: "The very incapacity of the disciples to recognise the Messiah in Him, and to apprehend the object of His ministry, is described more strongly in order to show the dignity and majesty of His person." We should inform our readers, that Dr. Davidson is attempting to prove that St. Mark's Gospel contains higher views of our Lord's person than either Matthew's or Luke's; and that the facts have been tampered with by its author for this purpose. Again,\* "In this Gospel the teacher is subordinated to the doer of mighty deeds. The mild, persuasive, authoritative instructor, such as He appeared in the Sermon on the Mount, becomes a mighty personage, who

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 100.

sets up an imperishable kingdom by the overwhelming power of His acts," &c. &c. *passim*. Our readers may wonder why Dr. Davidson is taking all this trouble. We will inform them. The object is to show the effect which peculiar *tendencies* have had on its historical character. This is a fair specimen of high criticism, which quietly assumes the point which it ought to prove. It seems to us that "the mild, persuasive, authoritative instructor of the Sermon on the Mount," would have been simply a ridiculous personage, unless He had been supported by the performance of some of those mighty acts, on the historical truth of which, though our author has nowhere expressly denied, he has done his utmost to throw considerable doubt, and expressly declared that it is a matter of great indifference, with respect to the truth of Christianity, to maintain. The "I say unto you," of the Sermon, in which the speaker puts himself on a level, in point of authority, with the Divine voice at Sinai, must have appeared ridiculous egotism in the eyes of the assembled multitude, if they could have seen in Him nothing but the outward appearance of a carpenter who was thrusting himself into Moses' chair.

The Gospel according to the Tübingen School "is, in fact, a new evangelium, which, as we have already intimated, ought to be designated *the Gospel according to the Tendencies*." "We observe in Mark's Gospel," says Dr. Davidson, "a tendency to separate discourses addressed to the disciples, from those meant for such as were without, or, in other words, a distinction is drawn between His exoteric and His esoteric discourses." Now for the proof of this assertion: First. The statement of Mark, that the disciples asked their Master the meaning of a parable within the walls of a house. Secondly. Their having asked Him a question in a house on the subject of marriage. Thirdly. His addressing the people only in parables on the day when He uttered the Parable of the Sower; and His explaining them in private to His disciples. This is the basis on which the assertion rests, that Mark designed to represent our Lord as having an exoteric and esoteric doctrine, after the manner of the philosophers. Is it possible that Dr. Davidson does not see that such reasonings can only avail to prove it, by first taking the truth of it for granted, and then by assuming that the facts have been distorted by the author of Mark's Gospel for that purpose?

But the believers in *the Gospel according to the Tendencies* are far from being agreed as to the direction towards which they tend. Mark on one or two occasions describes our Lord

as accompanying His miracles with some outward sign. The author of the Gospel has been represented as having considered them as means which might have been conducive to effect a cure. Some of these critics assert that the presence of this peculiar trait indicates an earlier form of the narrative ; others a later. Here then doctors disagree ; and when they do so, who shall decide ? Dr. Davidson seems to be troubled with no doubt as to whose right it is to seat himself in the chair of authority. " Surely," says he, " this indicates a later reflectiveness, uniting the natural with the supernatural." We are not quite so sure about it ; but have a vague idea that the oldest form of the supernatural has been usually united with some material accompaniment, as in magic, and charming, which have been found among the most barbarous tribes wholly destitute of a religion.

It is a matter of life and death to this school of critics to establish the late date of the Gospels ; accordingly our author catches at any straw which he can make to point in this direction. Having laid it down as a canon, that whenever an evangelist attributes high dignity to our Lord, it is a proof of late authorship, he has endeavoured to prove that the author of Mark distorted the facts of this Gospel and the sayings of Christ with this end in view. Among his proofs of this Dr. Davidson adduces the passage in Mark which asserts the ignorance of the Son of the time of the end. The reasoning seems to us to denote so entire an absence of perception of the connection between premisses and conclusions, that we quote the passage lest our readers should think that we have been guilty of misrepresenting the author.

" A calm consideration of the three Synoptics in their mutual relations favours the view, that the Son is placed higher in Mark than in Matthew or Luke. In the passage referred to, He is said by implication to know what is hidden from the angels themselves : ' Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels that are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' Hence a superhuman nature is ascribed to the Son during His abode on earth. He is a being intermediate between God and the angels. This view of His person is later than that of the first or the third Gospels, which present Him as a man elevated to Divine dignity. Omniscience they do not attribute to Him even in such passages as Luke x. 32, Matthew xi. 29, xxix. 18. The last place indeed cannot be compared with Mark xiii. 32, because it sets forth the words of the risen Saviour. Thus the Christology of Mark xiii. 32, so far from showing the priority of His Gospel to those of Matthew and Luke, favours the opposite view, since the person of Christ stands higher and His knowledge is greater

than in the other Synoptics. The words 'Neither the Son' are an addition to the original in Matthew."

If we understand Dr. Davidson rightly, he considers that this piece of reasoning proves that the author of Mark foisted the words "Neither the Son" into the passage as it stands in Matthew, for the purpose of investing our Lord's person with a higher degree of dignity. If this was his object, no impostor ever more completely failed of attaining the end which he had in view; for the whole passage has produced the contrary impression on at least 999 out of every 1,000 of his readers. Unless we are mistaken, it has always been considered the most difficult text in the Bible to reconcile with the Divinity of Christ, and has proved the stronghold of Socinian writers. To ourselves, who believe in the proper human, no less than the Divine, character of our Redeemer, the words have never formed any real difficulty; but we think that it has been reserved for Dr. Davidson and his school to discover that they were actually invented by the writer for the purpose of impressing on his readers a higher view of our Lord's person.

Dr. Davidson admits that the author of Mark was in possession of Matthew's Gospel when he wrote the passage, and asserts that his object in inventing it was to represent that our Lord was a being intermediate between God and the angels. If this were the case, we ask him to inform us, on what conceivable principle he acted in striking out the whole of Matthew xxv., which contains the description of the Son of Man seated on the throne of His glory, surrounded by the angels of His might, and sitting in judgment on an assembled world. Does not this whole description, not by a far-fetched implication, but plainly, assert that the Son of Man is a being higher than the angels? Do they not act merely in the capacity of His ministering servants, augmenting the dignity of Him who is seated on the throne? Is not the knowledge ascribed to Him, if not omniscience, very like it? Does not the Son of Man declare that works of love are always rendered to Himself; and thereby claim to be the centre of moral obligation? Dr. Davidson tells us, that the historical and archæological explanations given in this Gospel are "often unimportant and prosaic, unsuitable and trifling." We should think that the author of Mark must have been a prosaic and trifling man indeed, if he thought that he was likely to enhance his readers' ideas of the dignity of His Master's person, by striking out the description of the Son of Man sitting on the throne of His

glory, and inserting in the middle of Matthew's words, "Neither the angels of heaven, but My Father only," the expression, "Neither the Son." We can only attribute such a criticism to the fact that an habitual use of a microscope has destroyed Dr. Davidson's vision of common objects.

But this is not all. Our author tells us, that Matt. xi. 27, and Luke x. 22, will not compare in the dignity of view which they give of our Lord's Divine Person, with the interpolation which the author of Mark introduced into Matthew's text. Now, what do our readers think that these words really are?—for Dr. Davidson is wise in not quoting them, but only referring to them—"All things are delivered unto Me of My Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son *is willing* to reveal Him." As no possible reason can be given why Mark xiii. 32 sets forth a higher view of the dignity of our Lord's Person than this passage, it is evident that the sole authority for such an assertion is the *ipse dixit* of our author.

Let us now see how he deals with Matt. xxviii. 18,—“All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth,” followed as it is by the baptismal formula. “They are the words,” says he, “of the risen Saviour.” In another place he pronounces that the baptismal formula “savours of a later time. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles that baptism was always into the name of Christ or unto Christ.”\* It is worthy of remark that the author here condescends to quote the Acts as an authority, although he asserts, as we shall see presently, that it is almost entirely unhistorical. Truly, to criticism of this kind, all things are possible!

One more example of Dr. Davidson's mode of historical criticism, and we shall leave him as a critic of St. Mark's Gospel in the hands of our readers. He pronounces the words, “Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice,” one of the prosaic and trifling additions of the author. Whether it be so or no, it is, as we contend, a matter of taste, of which we think Dr. Davidson a bad judge. But when he says, “The first crowing reminding Peter of the words of Jesus, must have prevented a second denial,” we consider the assertion simply as proving that Dr. Davidson has but a small acquaintance with human nature or the power of temptation. Peter's mind was thoroughly unhinged, and

nothing is more likely than that accusation following accusation in increasing intensity, and culminating with the hint that he had been seen in the garden with his Master, would not only drive out of his mind our Lord's original warning, but that of the first cock-crowing, which was separated from the last denial by at least the interval of an hour. To assert that the first cock-crowing must have prevented Peter's second denial shows that our author has not the smallest conception of what is the overwhelming influence of fear when the mind has once lost its balance, and to deny its authenticity on such grounds is pure trifling.

We wish that our space would allow us to enter on an equally minute criticism of the reasonings employed in the Introduction of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospel; but as our attention has been deeply arrested by his criticisms on the Acts of the Apostles, we shall pass on at once to that subject.

Dr. Davidson admits that this book was written by the author of the third Gospel; but he denies that either of them was composed by St. Luke. According to him, both the Gospel and the Acts were composed by some Christian of the Pauline school, who was desirous of smoothing over the differences between Pauline and Petrine Christianity; and who for that purpose has not scrupled to falsify the history. His opinion of the historical accuracy of the Acts is eminently unfavourable. At p. 257, vol. ii., the author says, "If the preceding observations be correct, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is but partially authentic." This, however, is a very mild statement of the results of his criticism, for when we examine it in detail we find that by far the larger portion of the book is condemned as unhistorical. Nearly every discourse is described as largely an invention of the author's, and not a few of the facts as misrepresentations, and many of them as pure inventions.

The foundation of our author's criticism is the often reiterated dogma of the Tübingen School, that the history of the New Testament has been gradually developed out of a violent opposition between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Primitive Church—to which we have already alluded. The chief ground for this assumption, as our readers are aware, is the pretended Clementines. Having assumed the truth of this dogma, they endeavour to support it by means of those Epistles of St. Paul the genuineness of which they have not ventured to deny. Our readers should observe that it is only possible to adduce these as evidence by first assuming the truth of the dogma in question.



A critic of the New Testament ought not to be an advocate. His proper function is that of a judge. This Dr. Davidson has utterly forgotten. He brings forward every kind of evidence which can be made to bear the appearance of supporting his own position, and simply ignores that of a contrary character. We can forgive this in a professional advocate, whose simple duty is to serve the cause of his client. When he has not good arguments, he must use the best which he can get, and put them forth with the assurance as though they were indisputable. A speaker in Cicero's *De Divinatione* observes that he could not tell how augurs, when they encountered one another in the streets, could help laughing in one another's faces. Advocates manage to preserve their countenances when they meet in public; but no man of sense imagines that they are the dupes of their own reasonings. But the functions of a judge are different. His duty is to tell the jury when the reasonings are worthless, and the evidence bad. Such ought to be done by every critic who writes an introduction to the study of the New Testament. We deeply regret that Dr. Davidson has not thought it his duty to do so. A set of reasonings more worthless for the purpose of proving the conclusions for which they are adduced, it has never been our lot to peruse. We have too much respect for the author to believe that he has consciously brought forward evidence which he knows to be worthless; but we can only excuse him from the charge of having done so by supposing that he is the dupe of his own bad reasonings, and by taking it for granted that he has assumed the entire point at issue without being aware of it.

Dr. Davidson has referred to Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*. We presume, therefore, that he has read it through, and has meditated on the evidence which it contains in favour of the authenticity of the Acts. We shall not dispute that one or two points are pressed in Paley's work somewhat beyond what the evidence will justify. But yet, if we admit this, the force of what remains is immense. We greatly doubt whether criminals who are convicted on circumstantial evidence in courts of justice are usually convicted on evidence of equal strength. It is generally admitted that the evidence, as adduced by Paley, of a number of the most undesigned coincidences between St. Paul's epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, is of the strongest character. Let us hear how Dr. Davidson disposes of the entire reasonings of the *Horæ Paulinæ*.

"It has been thought,"\* says he, "that the coincidences between it and the Pauline Epistles prove the validity of the narratives; that there are no real discrepancies, but such substantial correspondence as might be expected from independent writers, each narrating the same thing in his own manner, and with different objects. Since Paley explored this field, many believe that he set the whole argument in the clearest light, and vindicated the credibility of both, by showing that the writer of the history did not copy from the author of the Epistles, or *vice versa*, but that the coincidences are undesigned. Such evidence, however, has not appeared satisfactory to all. We shall examine it under the following heads: "I. The general conduct and teaching of the Apostles as set forth in the work. II. Various particulars in the book disagreeing with other writings. III. The nature and form of the speeches interspersed. IV. The historical narratives."

We submit to Dr. Davidson that his mode of examination is no examination of Paley's argument at all. If he wishes to destroy its force, he must prove that the undesigned coincidences adduced by Paley do not exist; or that it is possible that the Acts of the Apostles can be of the nature which he asserts, and their coincidences be real. This he has not attempted, nor can we find that any portion of his subsequent reasoning either proves his position or touches Paley's argument.

Dr. Davidson tells us "that such evidence has not appeared satisfactory to all." We are quite aware that there are some persons so constituted that they cannot appreciate circumstantial evidence. This was painfully brought to our notice after the conviction of both Palmer and Müller. We believe, when the will tends in a contrary direction, that there is a numerous class of men who can appreciate evidence of no kind. It is incredible what impossible theories minds of this description are prepared to set up and believe. We repeat, before our author is entitled to pass the sweeping condemnation which he has on the historical character of the Acts of the Apostles, Paley's reasonings require not only to be noticed by him in such a loose manner as "that they do not appear entirely satisfactory to some," but to receive a direct refutation.

But we will proceed to address ourselves to the author's reasonings, and first to his position that the Acts of the Apostles hopelessly contradicts the assertions of the Epistles written by the Apostle's own hand, as to the position which

---

\* P. 209, vol. ii.

he occupied as the opponent of Judaism. Of this we submit that Dr. Davidson has not produced a single tittle of evidence, except by first assuming the whole question in dispute.

As far as St. Paul's Epistles are concerned, it is evident that if this point can be proved at all, it can only be proved by the Epistle to the Galatians. Dr. Davidson declares that the assertions of this Epistle are so thoroughly anti-Judaic, that it is impossible that the Paul of the Acts can have uttered the discourses or performed the actions which are attributed to him by the author.

We can only see this impossibility by first taking it for granted that St. Paul was opposed to Judaism in the sense affirmed by the writers of the Tubingen School. If we take this for granted, passages may be quoted from the Epistle not absolutely inconsistent with this view. But what we affirm is, that it is utterly impossible to prove it from the Epistle itself; that the peculiar temperament and circumstances of the writer must be taken into consideration; and that the passages in question must be qualified by others equally strong on the other side in his other epistles.

Dr. Davidson is at perfect liberty to quote the strongest passage he pleases from the Epistle to the Galatians. We on the other side insist in placing beside them equally strong ones from the other unquestionable epistles of St. Paul. "To the Jews," says he, "I became a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law; to the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." While such passages exist in the Pauline writings, and others involving kindred sentiments, it is impossible for Dr. Davidson to deal with the Acts of the Apostles in the way he does, without first assuming what it is necessary that he should prove.

Our author refers to the following events recorded in the Acts, gravely pronounces them inconsistent with the character of the Apostle as it is depicted in the Galatians, and by consequence charges the author with having invented them for the purpose of conciliation. His proofs are St. Paul's leaving his work at Ephesus for the purpose of attending a feast at Jerusalem; his shaving his head at Cenchrea because he had a vow; his circumcision of Timothy; his undergoing a process of Nazariteship in the Temple; in a word, the various other

Jewish observances ascribed to St. Paul in the Acts, and his friendly visits to and reception by the Jerusalem Church.

We own that, with the passage which we have cited from the First Epistle to the Corinthians before us, we are unfeignedly surprised at this criticism of Dr. Davidson. Is it possible that he does not see that to reason thus is to beg the entire question? Why might not the man who asserts that he was in the habit of becoming to the Jews a Jew, that he might gain the Jews, and all things to all men, that he might by all means gain some, have done every one of these things? Was not the Apostle animated by such a regard for his Jewish countrymen that he could write *Ἦχόμεν γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, even if we translate these words less strongly than in the Authorised Version, "I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren?" We maintain that it is utterly illogical in Dr. Davidson to take the one set of passages and ignore the other; and that taking both together there is nothing in the statements of the Acts of the Apostles which, when they are compared with the general tenor of St. Paul's character as portrayed in his epistles, throws the slightest suspicion on their historical character.

We ask, why might not a man of St. Paul's opinions have attended Jewish feasts and adopted Jewish rites, if by so doing he had any chance of obtaining a more favourable hearing from his countrymen? Why might he not have circumcised Timothy, if his doing so was a necessary condition for procuring him a *locus standi* in a Jewish synagogue? There is nothing inconsistent in St. Paul, a born Jew, practising the national rites of his countrymen, and yet maintaining that they were needless for salvation, and, if preached as necessary to it, destructive to the Gospel. Perhaps the high critical school will discover ere long that all the passages in the Pauline Epistles which speak of his spirit of compromise and accommodation are interpolations.

The class of critics to which Dr. Davidson belongs never condescend to bring their theories to the test of the ordinary facts of life. One of these is worth a thousand arbitrary assumptions. We apprehend that the difference in principle between the Ritualists and their opponents is no bad representation of that which Dr. Davidson and his friends consider to have existed between Petrine and Pauline Christianity. We think that we are as strongly opposed to Ritualism as St. Paul was to Judaism. Still we should not hesitate to officiate in a Ritualistic church, if we considered that by so doing we could become the means of propagating a higher and more

spiritual Christianity. Now, if our having thus acted were recorded in the newspapers of the day, it would be absurd for some writer eighteen hundred years after to argue from a letter of ours, in which we expressed a belief that the principles of Ritualism, in the manner in which they were taught by Ritualists, were conducting us back to Judaism, that the account in the newspapers was a perversion of the truth of history, to subserve some purpose of the writer.

But Dr. Davidson proceeds,\* "According to the Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle's mission was to the Gentiles from the beginning (Gal. i. 16)." This passage is, "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to those which were Apostles before me, but I departed into Arabia, and returned again into Damascus. Then after three years I went to Jerusalem, &c."

Now what do our readers suppose is the use that Dr. Davidson tries to make of this reference? Nothing less than to prove that all the passages in the Acts which describe St. Paul as going to the Jews, before he addressed himself to the Gentiles, are unhistorical. Accordingly he proceeds to tell us that the author of the Acts, in direct contravention to the Apostle's own assertion, represents him immediately after his conversion as going into the synagogues at Damascus, and that, driven thence, he laboured among his countrymen in Judea. Visions and revelations, says he, are necessary to turn him from the Jews to the Gentiles, which he did with apparent reluctance. Our author proceeds to enumerate every instance in which the Apostle is described in the Acts as entering a Jewish synagogue before he opened his mission to the Gentiles. He then draws the following conclusion: "Thus the book sets forth a man who systematically went to the Jews first, and continued to address them until he was forced to seek another audience," &c. &c.

Now, in order that this reasoning should afford a semblance of a proof of Dr. Davidson's position, it would be necessary that the Apostle should have asserted that he received a commission from Jesus Christ to preach to the Gentiles and to no other. We submit that the words *ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* imply nothing of the kind. They mean that God revealed His Son to Paul with the ultimate purpose that he should preach

\* Vol. ii., page 209.

Him among the Gentiles, and nothing more. Was the man who could wish himself to become an anathema from Christ for the sake of his brethren, to conclude that this revelation required him to forsake them for ever? Had he not, in the Epistle to the Romans, asserted the priority of the Jew in the Church, and was this not a sufficient reason for his addressing them first? Is the assumption that the man who had hitherto lived in the strictest Judaism must at once have divested himself of every portion of his own previous mental existence, the only possible one? Has Dr. Davidson never heard, that powerful prejudices sometimes act on men's minds, and cause them to act inconsistently with their principles? Or did he never hear that men with the strongest convictions in their minds, have thought it their duty to await the guidings of Providence to supply them with the means of carrying them out in action? In fine, is it not a fact, that the teaching of our Lord forbids persecution for religion: and, notwithstanding this, have not many of His sincere followers been grievous persecutors? Dr. Davidson can hardly help knowing all this, and yet the bias of an *a priori* theory is so strong in him, that he ventures to assert that this passage in the Galatians affords proof that whenever the author of the Acts describes St. Paul as first entering a Jewish place of worship, and addressing himself to his countrymen before he preached to the Gentiles, he has been guilty of inventing fictions, instead of recording the facts of history.

But even if it were true that St. Paul entertained the views of his mission which Dr. Davidson attributes to him, it is quite possible that prudential reasons might have led him to adopt the course which is ascribed to him in the Acts. It not unfrequently occurs to even the most zealous missionary to consider what are the most suitable means for effectuating his object. A Protestant missionary might go to China with the settled purpose of preaching Christianity to none but the Chinese Buddhists. But a little observation and reflection might convince him, that the readiest way of effecting his purpose might be by first addressing himself to those natives who are of the Roman Catholic faith, and by labouring to infuse into them his principles, and inspire them with his zeal. If he could succeed, he would enlist into the work a body of native Christians, who could bring influence to bear on their countrymen, which a foreigner would be utterly unable.

It is a certain fact, that in most of the cities of the Roman Empire a body of Jews had established themselves prior to the arrival of the Apostles. These had produced a considerable



religious impression, and had collected a number of converts from the native populations, who had become more or less imbued with the principle of Theism. This body of men were generally of a more liberal cast of mind than the Jew proper, and had extensive connections among the heathen population. All the allusions to Judaism in the classical writers prove that the religious influence of the Jew had been considerable, whenever he had been long established. Might it not have occurred to St. Paul, that the best mode of winning over the heathen to Christianity, was by approaching them through the leading Jews and proselytes, and enlisting them into the service as a body of missionaries, to act on the Pagan population? If he had done so, it would fully justify the author of the Acts in ascribing to him the line of conduct which he has.

It seems all but incredible that some one or other of these views of the matter did not occur to Dr. Davidson as likely to be true. But instead of reasoning the point, he gives utterance to the following piece of pure dogmatism, which not even those who are presumptuous enough to question his infallibility can think of gainsaying. "The revelation of Jesus Christ within him was one which led to the Gentiles at once, and was further sanctioned by the older Apostles. Did he not see his special mission at the first? Did he soon abandon the Jerusalem compact, and go to the Jews as he had been doing before, according to the story in the Acts? Was his mind gradually opened through the experience of outward circumstances, till he forsook the custom of seeking the Jews first, and confined his labours to the Gentiles? We cannot think so." We beg to assure Dr. Davidson that if he cannot, we are very sorry for him, for no logical mind will dignify such arguments with the name of reasoning.

With respect to the assertion in the Epistle that he went into Arabia and returned again into Damascus, and after three years he went to Jerusalem; and the concise account given in the Acts, that he continued certain days with the disciples in Damascus, and immediately preached Christ in the synagogue; and after some time the Jews sought to kill him, and that he escaped in a basket over the wall, and then went to Jerusalem: we would ask Dr. Davidson to consider whether similar omissions are not common enough in ordinary life? Does he mean to tell us that whenever there are similar omissions or discrepancies, it is a proof that one of the narrators has been a forger? We invite him to peruse the various accounts of Louis XVI.'s flight to Varennes which were published by different persons who were agents in it, and ask him

whether he is prepared to assume the unhistorical character of the event itself, on account of the numerous discrepancies which they contain. We firmly believe that no English judge would allow a jury to hang a dog on the evidence on which Dr. Davidson gibbets the author of the Acts as a forger of history.

Dr. Davidson proceeds to tell us, that there is nothing distinctively Pauline, "as justification by faith and redemption by the blood of Jesus," in the discourse at Athens, and on the strength of this, to charge the author with largely modifying it. Our author seems to think that St. Paul resembled certain modern preachers, who can only ring the changes on certain theological shibboleths, however inappropriate the occasion may be for introducing them. He further complains that the discourse to the elders of the Church at Ephesus contains only one Pauline idea, namely, the allusion to the death of Christ. We beg to assure him that we can find several more, and can only lament that his vision should be so impaired by *à priori* theories. St. Paul's appeal to his hearers that they knew how he had conducted himself from the first day he came among them, breathes the very mind of the writer of the Epistles to the Corinthians—"Ye know, and God also, how holily and unblameably we conducted ourselves among you," certainly agrees with the mind of one who was in the habit of appealing to God as to the purity of his motives. Not because we love you not, God knoweth. "Serving the Lord" (*δουλεύων τῷ κυρίῳ*) reminds us of him who made himself the slave (*δοῦλος*) of Jesus Christ. "With all humility of mind" (*ταπεινοφροσύνης*) is not unlike him who tells the Corinthians that he had been base (*ταπεινός*) among them. "And with many tears" reminds us of him who told the Philippian, *even weeping*, that many of them walked like enemies to the cross of Christ. The temptations which he speaks of as arising from the plots of the Jews against his life, have a not very remote resemblance to the man who elsewhere states that he was "often in perils among false brethren." His assertion "that he had kept back nothing that was profitable to them," to him who feelingly asks, "Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" and his teaching publicly, and from house to house, resembles the act of one who felt for his converts the "care which a father does for his children." In his "teaching repentance towards God," we catch the echo of the words of him who wrote, "Sorrow according to God," *ἡ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη*, "worketh repentance unto salvation never to be repented of," and "faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," of innu-

merable passages in his writings. But we have only gone through twelve lines in the Greek of the Apostle's address, and have found Pauline expressions in every one of them. There are thirty-four more; yet Dr. Davidson says, "With this exception, nothing distinctly Pauline appears in it." We suppose that he will say that these are only bad imitations. To us, however, who can only follow common sense, this is not so clear, but, on the contrary, they breathe the very essence of St. Paul's mind.

An objection is next made, that the "discourse at Antioch contains an instance of Pauline doctrine at its close in a gentler form," and he quotes the words, "Be it known unto you, therefore, that through this Man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they cannot be justified by the law of Moses." In what that peculiar gentleness consists we are not informed, and we confess that we are ignorant. But if it is intended to insinuate that the discourse has been modified by the writer to suit his own purposes, we think that the idea is a pure phantasy of the critic.

"The centre and substance of the Pauline ministry," says Dr. Davidson, "consisted in man's universal sinfulness, justification by faith without works, and the abolition of the law. . . . None of these is inculcated in St. Paul's discourses recorded in the Acts." To this statement we demur. But, supposing it were true, we wish to ask Dr. Davidson whether he has never heard that men sometimes accommodate their discourses to the state of mind of those whom they are addressing? Would he preach the same style of sermon to a congregation of Mahometans or heathens which he would to an enlightened Christian congregation? Pearls should not be cast before swine. If the author of the Acts had inserted allusions to the doctrine of justification by faith in the discourses addressed to the stupid Lystrians, or even to the polished Athenians, Dr. Davidson would not have failed to charge him with being a silly impostor. If, on the other hand, the utter abolition of the Jewish law had formed the theme of the address delivered from the Temple stairs, then we should have heard the Paul of the Acts accused of having courted martyrdom, and a sharp contrast pointed out between him and the Paul of the Epistles. With critics of this school the author of the Acts cannot help being in evil case. He resembles one whose fate it is never to beat, but always to be beaten.

Want of space will not allow us to do justice to the critique

on the council at Jerusalem as recorded in the Acts, and St. Paul's account of his visit to Jerusalem as given in the Galatians. It will be sufficient to say, that it is characterised by all the faults already pointed out, by an assumption of first principles which involve the point at issue, and by a careful ignoring of the evidence on the other side of the question.

Our author urges that the account of St. Paul's interview with the Jews at Rome is a proof of the unhistorical character of the book. He argues, on the authority of the Epistle to the Romans, that there must have been a considerable number of Jewish Christians at Rome; and that it is impossible that the Jews there could have been so ignorant of Paul or the Christian Church as they represent themselves to have been. So far we entirely agree with him. But he next asserts that the author of the Acts represents that the Jews urged nothing but the truth; and consequently that he entirely misconceived of the whole matter. We are at a loss to see where this is asserted or implied. Dr. Davidson is aware that the Jews on this occasion, as is usually the case where legal proceedings are involved, may have acted on the principle of reserve. But he dismisses it in the following manner: "It is idle to suppose that the leading Jews dissembled on the occasion speaking what they knew to be untrue, or that they employed an official reserve. The whole narrative supposes that the author of the Acts conceived their whole procedure to be honest and open. They appointed him a day for conversation, &c."

We are unable to discern the *idleness* of this supposition. Any person who has had experience in the wide world, and above all in legal proceedings, knows that nothing is more common among men in a similar situation to that in which the Jews found themselves, than the use of reserve, or of expressions which are only true in a very qualified sense. We should have thought that in his dealings with religious partisans, Dr. Davidson must have met with many who have acted in a manner similar to that which the author of the Acts describes these Jews to have done. As to his own opinion about their conduct, so far is it from being evident that he thought "the whole procedure to be honest and open," that his words do not contain the slightest trace of an opinion one way or the other. They are as follow: "And they said unto him, We neither received letters out of Judæa concerning thee, neither any of the brethren that came showed or spake any harm of thee. But we desire to hear what thou thinkest, for as concerning this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken

against." It seems to us, that this is the language of men who were careful of committing themselves too far.

St. Paul's assertion, "I have committed nothing against the customs of our fathers," is adduced as proving the unhistorical character of the narrative. He asserts that it would have been untrue. All his energies, says he,\* were devoted to the overthrow of the Mosaic institutions, by preaching faith in Christ as a substitute. How is it that Dr. Davidson does not see that his reasoning involves an assumption of the point at issue? St. Paul, like his Master, viewed Christianity as the fulfilment of the law of Moses, in the carrying it out to its full and complete ideal. This is again and again asserted by them both. The preaching of this was a very different thing from "directing all his energies to the overthrow of the Mosaic institutions." Will Dr. Davidson kindly point out what portion of St. Paul's Epistles proves that he did so consistently with his express assertions as to the relation in which the Mosaic institutions stood to Christianity? We are far from wishing to contend that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, but there is one passage in it which represents his view of the true position of the Mosaic institutions; τὸ δὲ παλαιότερον καὶ γηράσκον ἔργον ἀφασμοῦ, that which is antiquated and grown old is near disappearing. "It is perfectly consistent with his whole character, teaching, and position, that he should have said that he had committed nothing against the customs of our fathers." To assert on such evidence that the author of the Acts has invented this portion of the narrative, is only consistent with the supposition that Dr. Davidson has made up his mind to prove its unhistorical character *per fas et nefas*.

The following seventeen pages are occupied by an elaborate attempt to prove that the discourses in the Acts contain sentiments which have been falsely assigned to Peter, James, and Paul. On the principles adopted, it would be very easy to prove that the speeches and deeds attributed to Robespierre in ordinary histories of the French Revolution were never uttered or done by him. It may be urged that it is obviously impossible that a man who at one period of his life refused a judgeship sooner than condemn criminals to death, could have either acted or spoken in the way which he has been said to have done. Do not even many of his speeches contain some of the most noble utterances of humanity, and the most exalted principles, which were ever

---

\* P. 226.

spoken? Was he not a man perfectly incorruptible? It is only necessary to take for granted the truth of one or two *à priori* dogmas to prove that he had nothing to do with the acts of the Revolutionary Tribunal, and that his connection with the atrocities of the Reign of Terror has been invented and foisted into history by persons who have written under anti-democratic tendencies.

The same reasons which compel Dr. Davidson to reject the discourses of St. Peter, which are recorded in the Acts, as unhistorical, lead him boldly to deny the authenticity of his First Epistle, and to declare that it is the work of a Christian imbued with Pauline sentiments, who, for the purpose of smoothing down the differences between the Petrine and Pauline parties, must have forged the Epistle under Peter's name. Nothing in the form of assertion on the part of Dr. Davidson can now surprise our readers, though they will hardly be prepared for the fact that, while he admits that the Epistle was known to Polycarp and Papias, and that it is expressly quoted as Peter's by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, &c., notwithstanding this testimony in its favour, he rejects it on grounds purely internal. The old dogma, the opposition between Petrine and Pauline Christianity, is again invoked. The Epistle contains a large number of Pauline sentiments. It is therefore unauthentic and a forgery, although it was held to be St. Peter's by men who not only were removed from the Apostles by only a single generation, but who had conversed with those who had conversed with them.

The quiet manner in which writers of this school take it for granted that holy men could forge books under other people's names is astonishing. It is impossible to deny the chastened aspect of holiness which this Epistle presents to us. Yet the difficulty which naturally presents itself to ordinary people, that it is impossible that a man who could compose such a writing should deliberately sit down and forge a letter in Peter's name, and imitate the circumstances of his life, seems not to be esteemed by them worthy of a passing notice. It is thought sufficient to assure us that frauds were common, and people very credulous in those days; and it is taken for granted, however holy a man might be, that he could never scruple to commit a pious fraud. We cannot think that the facility with which this is taken for granted is very creditable to the moral perceptions of this school of writers.

Dr. Davidson is troubled with no scruples of this kind. He quotes a considerable number of passages from the Epistle,



and prints beside them others from St. Paul's Epistles which bear a greater or less resemblance to them in point of thought and expression. On the strength of these he maintains that "the author had read the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians at least, if not others, and that both their ideas and phraseology had become incorporated with his religious consciousness." We maintain that the resemblances in question, united as they are with considerable diversities, are far too few to establish such a position. Nothing is easier than off-hand assertions, that similarities of style prove that one man has copied from another. But no evidence can be more uncertain. We would ask critics of this school whether they have yet succeeded in constructing any canons of even tolerable validity which can determine what amount of similarity of style is necessary before it can afford proof that one writing has been borrowed from another; or what degree of evidence is necessary before it can be established that two works professing to be written by the same author cannot have been so owing to diversity of style. We are far from wishing to deny that a large degree of diversity is not a sufficient proof of difference of authorship, or that sameness of verbal expression, carried over a sufficiently large space, does not prove that one writer has copied from another. Two styles, for example, so widely distinguished from each other as those of St. John's Gospel, and Bishop Hall's Contemplations, cannot possibly have come from the same pen. But until some canons can be laid down on this subject, the truth of which has been tested by very extensive inductions, arguments founded on similarity or diversity of style, where the difference is within moderate limit, mean little else than a cover for hiding the bias of the writer. We know many books where similarity of thought exists, far more close than that which Dr. Davidson adduces, which it would be absurd to urge as a proof that the authors had borrowed from each other, and where greater divergences can be found, which would wholly fail to prove difference of authorship.

The facility with which our author pronounces writings to be spurious, or mere questions of style, or purity of language, if exercised on a less serious subject, would be truly amusing. Thus, at p. 300, he tells us, "The style of writing is too good for James, being pure, elevated, poetical, betraying the influence of Grecian culture. . . . But all we know of him, and all that can be reasonably inferred from his education, training, and cast of mind, makes it highly improbable that he could write such Greek as that of the Epistle," &c.

From this passage one is led to imagine that our knowledge of James is large, and derived from trustworthy sources, whereas, it is small, and the little which we know is not of the most reliable character. It is certainly wholly insufficient to enable us to determine that the Greek of the Epistle could not have been written by him. Let us illustrate it by an example which will make the worthlessness of such reasonings apparent. Hugh Miller was the son of a sailor, passed his early life as a stonemason, and wrought for many years at the trade. But not only is his English of a very superior character, but it is distinguished by the very excellences which Dr. Davidson has ascribed to the author of the Epistle, and which he adduces as an argument that it cannot have been written by St. James. The same reasoning will be equally valid to enable some high critic of the future to infer that the writings of Hugh Miller are spurious, and that the language is such that no one of his training could have produced.

Dr. Davidson asserts on evidence such as we have described that the Epistle was not written by Simon Peter; but that it was forged by some Pauline Christian; and that it succeeded in getting accepted as the work of the Apostle within a few years after its publication. A careful study of the Epistle has convinced us that it contains a number of passages which breathe the very spirit and imply the presence of the Peter whose character is portrayed to us in such lively colour in the pages of the Gospels; not the very identical form of that character, it is true, but one chastened and subdued; and one which had learned to attach great importance to the virtues which were the opposite to his own failings. It may be said that the allusion to the Peter of the Gospels in the Second Epistle is such as any forger might easily imitate; and we shall not deny it. But this is not the character of those in the First Epistle, which are most delicate and undesigned. They require considerable study to be observed. Now, why is this evidence in favour of the authority of the Epistle entirely ignored by Dr. Davidson? It makes against him, and he has adopted a foregone conclusion. If the Epistle was really written by Peter, his theory about the opposition between Petrine and Pauline Christianity falls to the ground. The result is, that he adopts the course of all those who ride a favourite hobby—he strains at a gnat, while he swallows a camel.

Our space will not allow us to follow Dr. Davidson through his minute criticism of the discourses in the Acts; we shall only notice one or two of his shorter arguments. St. Peter's

address to Cornelius is pronounced to be altogether Pauline. Our readers, however, will recollect that the author has declared that the three characteristics of Pauline authorship are, the universal sinfulness of man, justification by faith without works, and the abolition of the Mosaic dispensation. On the strength of the presumed absence of these doctrines, Dr. Davidson has pronounced that the discourses which the author of the Acts has ascribed to St. Paul are not his. Here, however, it is necessary to prove that the discourse addressed to Cornelius is not St. Peter's. It is, therefore, declared to be "altogether Pauline," although it contains no distinctive assertion of either of these three Pauline doctrines. When it suits him, other evidences of Paulinism will suffice: "The very commencement," says he, "'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him,' &c., resembles Paul's 'glory, honour, and peace to him that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.'"

We think that Dr. Davidson must be at a loss for solid arguments, to urge this remote similarity as a proof that the discourse is not Peter's. It is also impossible to forget that he has already urged the fact that the author of the Acts has represented Paul as always addressing the Jews in the first instance, when there were any in the places which he visited, as a proof that he is a misrepresenter of historical facts. Yet he does not scruple to quote this passage from the Romans, which contains the words, "to the Jew first," for an opposite purpose. But he goes on to argue in the same style, "How improbable is it that he was convinced at this time of the great truth, viz. that the Gentiles were fully entitled to all the privileges of Christianity. Not until the latter, by means of his missionary experiences, had taught that truth plainly under the notice of the leading Apostles at Jerusalem, did Peter, James, and John recognise it. The language here is Luke's, as before."

We, on the contrary, have always considered the opening words of the discourse as a strong proof of their authenticity, and to be precisely such as we might have expected that a man situated as St. Peter was would have given utterance to. The discourse opens abruptly, "*Ἐπ' ἀληθείας*," says St. Peter, "*καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ θεός*." These are just the words which would flow from a man who had hitherto had but an imperfect view of a great truth, but on whose mind its true character had suddenly burst in all its full proportions. We can recognise nothing in the

discourse inconsistent with the position of a man who had been hitherto under strong Jewish prejudices, and who, while he thought that the Gentiles were to enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of the Messiah, had hitherto considered that the only road of access to them lay through the door of the Jewish Church. The concluding words contain the remarkable expression, "He has commanded us to preach *unto the people* (*τῷ λαῷ*)," &c. We ask Dr. Davidson whether this expression savours of the narrowness of so-called Petrinism, or the universality of Paulinism? and if he would not be prepared, if this discourse had been ascribed to Paul, to assert its un-Pauline character, from its want of reference to the three great doctrines of the Apostle.

We are obliged to the author for conceding that the discourse at Athens may be Paul's to a considerable extent; but our satisfaction is greatly lessened by the assertion that the author of the Acts has interpolated it largely. "It is a condensed summary," says he, "of many discourses; the sentiments and part of the language may be Paul's, as they probably are." That it is a condensed summary of many discourses, the only evidence adduced is our author's *ipse dixit*. But he proceeds: "The place, the high court, the masters of Athenian wisdom, the partial correspondence between the idea that Jesus and the Anastasis were foreign deities, with the accusation against Socrates, the concluding words show the skill of the writer." It turns out, therefore, that the discourse was not spoken at Athens at all, and the greater part of it is an invention.

We suppose that all will agree that the discourse is an epitome. But Dr. Davidson tells us that "he cannot see how the Apostle proceeded so abruptly to the doctrine of the resurrection—a lesson which must have been revolting to his hearers—consistently with the wise adaptation which he uniformly practised. He must have known that the idea of a resurrection from the dead would have been an effectual barrier to the reception of Christianity," &c.

Our author's powers of vision are certainly particularly convenient. He is unable to see how a wise adapter of himself to circumstances like Paul, could have shocked philosophic ears by announcing the doctrine of the resurrection. But he can see the Apostle in a very different light when he has to address a Jewish auditory. Here his eagle vision at once shows him that his adapting his discourses to the circumstances of his hearers is a proof that they have been invented by the author of the Acts. Now St. Paul was either in the

habit of accommodating himself to circumstances, or he was not : if he was, then Dr. Davidson's inferences from St. Paul's bearing towards the Jews are groundless. If he was not, the utterance about the resurrection can form no reason for questioning the historical accuracy of the words before us. As to Dr. Davidson's assertion that St. Paul is represented as having been subjected to a regular judicial process before the Court of Areopagus, we meet it with a simple denial, that it was meant to be so represented by the author of the Acts. This observation about the intended parallel between Jesus and the resurrection, and the charge against Socrates as the introducer of foreign gods or demons, is nothing else than a pure phantasy, invented for the purpose of damaging the historical truthfulness of the author of the Acts.

Dr. Davidson brings a similar charge against the discourse addressed to the Ephesian elders. We have already adverted to it, and shall only cite a few of his arguments, for the purpose of exhibiting their worthlessness. "Instead of a hortatory and didactic element," says he, "Paul speaks of himself." We ask, has he not spoken of himself elsewhere? Again, "How could he thus recommend his own example instead of Christ's?" "Was it needful or natural to do so before persons among whom he had laboured for three years?" We answer, that he has again and again commended his own example to the Corinthians, where the historian expressly asserts that he continued a year and six months, and even a considerable time longer. Most people will be of opinion that the longer a man has lived among others, the more likely it would be that he would appeal to his own example, especially if he addressed them under the conviction that he should never see them again. On a mass of similar reasonings Dr. Davidson pronounces that the whole of the Petrine and Pauline discourses recorded in the Acts are almost entirely the invention of the author of the book.

That of Stephen shares the same fate. It contains, says he, numerous inaccurate statements and citations from the Old Testament. Therefore it could not have been uttered by him, but must have been composed for him by the author of the Acts. But why the latter must have committed these mistakes and not the former, is far from obvious. Again, he charges the author with introducing into his work facts which contradict authentic history. He is well aware that these have been repeatedly explained; but the same objection is repeated over again, without any notice of the explanations. Our author is a kind of critical Hydra, who has two heads

always in readiness to put out the moment one is demolished ; but when we lay hold of them, we find them to be only an optical delusion.

Our author's views on the subject of miracles are extremely liberal. They may have been realities or fictions, as each person's reason suggests ; and although the writers of the Gospels and the Acts have asserted the actual performance of great numbers of them, Christianity will not be affected as to its truth, if they one and all should turn out to be fictitious. Nay, the author carries his liberality to that degree as to consider the truth of Christianity to be entirely unaffected, whether our Lord's bodily resurrection was an objective fact, or whether it existed only in the fancies of His followers.

Dr. Davidson is, however, at no great pains to conceal his own opinion respecting many of those recorded in the Acts. "The Book of the Acts," says he,\* "is thickly studded with the miraculous. Such extravagances of the miraculous may lead the reader to reject it, not only on the occasions mentioned, but in others." His opinions are strikingly brought before us on points of this description, in his criticism of the historic truth of the conversion of St. Paul.

"The conversion of St. Paul," says he,† "is an historical fact, and the description of it in the ninth chapter substantially true." We took courage when we first read these words, and thought that we had at last attained to some definite historical standing-ground. Great was our disappointment to find that it was not better than a slippery bog. Dr. Davidson says, "It is best to conceive of the whole process of Paul's conversion as an inward operation. . . . The phenomena were subjective, not objective. . . . In any case, he believed the fact that he had seen Christ ; and although psychology cannot account for the revolution which took place in him, it is unnecessary, as it is unphilosophical, to assume that all the phenomena described as external were really so." He then refers to the fact that Paul could not always tell when he was in a state of ecstasy or not ; and to the effect of maladies of the epileptic kind, &c. At page 268, our author tells us "Parallels to the vision of Paul are not wanting. In the Life of Loyala we are informed that the blessed Virgin appeared to him one night, holding little Jesus in her arms. The apparition lasted a considerable time ; and during it, it seemed to him that his heart was purified within him. One day there

---

\* P. 244.

† P. 246.



was represented to him the mystery of the Holy Trinity, a vision which terribly affected him." Then follows the story of the conversion of Colonel Gardiner. Our author proceeds, "Was the revelation of the crucified Jesus to Paul self-illusion? Not in the ordinary meaning of the word. In a high sense of it, it may be called so," &c. It is impossible for us to quote the whole of the lengthy passage.

It seems, then, that the conversion of St. Paul, which Dr. Davidson tells us to be an historic fact, as it is recorded in the Acts, stands on the same level as the visions of the founder of the order of the Jesuits, and of Colonel Gardiner. When we compared the whole of this passage with the author's assertion that the truth of Christianity will not be affected whether it be or be not an objective fact that our Lord rose from the dead, we arrived at the conclusion, that the interval which separates such views from the entire rejection of Christianity as a Divine revelation, is a very inconsiderable one. We do not for one moment mean to imply, that Dr. Davidson rejects the truth of Christianity. Far from it. But we shall not be surprised to hear, that it forms the next stage of his mental development; we are firmly persuaded that the number of men is very small who can assume as true the principles of this work, and at the same time continue to believe that the New Testament contains a revelation from God to man.

The discussion of the various points raised by Dr. Davidson in connection with this subject, would occupy an entire article. We can, therefore, only express our deep conviction, that a mind which can mistake its states, which are only subjective, for objective realities, is thoroughly untrustworthy. If a number of men can think that they have seen and handled a human body, and have held repeated conversations with one who had shortly before been publicly put to death as a criminal, and the whole of this is the result of purely subjective impressions, and nothing external has been presented to their senses, they must live in that border land where self-delusion and imposture meet. We do not pretend to be able to account for some peculiar psychological phenomena which have been mistaken for objective facts; but we are well assured that it was impossible that a belief should have grown up among the primitive disciples, that their Master was risen from the dead, without a great deal of imposture, and the most unbounded credulity.

It is plain that St. Paul believed that he had seen Christ as an objective fact, and that on the truth of it he founded his

apostleship. It is no less certain that he was aware that he had been the subject of a supernatural illumination, during which he could not say whether he was in the body or out of it. But of this uncertainty he was fully aware. On this vision he pretended to found no revelations for mankind, but he expressly tells us, that what he saw was incapable of utterance in human language. He states that he mentioned it only in the foolish confidence of glorying, to which his opponents forced him. Apart from this, his language implies that he would not have spoken of it at all. But the Apostle not only thought that he had seen Christ with his bodily eyes, but expressly asserted his belief, that if Christ were not really risen from the dead, not only was Christianity a vain delusion, but that himself and the other Apostles were impostors. Our conclusion therefore is, that to assert that the evidence of Christianity is purely subjective, and that it is the same thing, as far as its truth is concerned, whether our Lord has or has not risen from the dead, or that it is not of the least importance whether Paul saw Christ as an outward fact, or only after the manner that Ignatius Loyola saw the Virgin and Child, is flatly to contradict the Apostle.

We deeply regret the conclusion at which Dr. Davidson has arrived, and submit to him that he has put forward a number of *a priori* theories, which are neither self-evident in themselves, nor supported by a tittle of proof, and then deluded himself into the belief that he is criticising the New Testament. What is the use of introducing into so serious a controversy, such worthless evidence as the following, "that the account does not tell us that St. Paul saw the Lord Jesus, but only the glory with which He was supposed to be accompanied"? Does he imagine that such nice points were likely to be attended to in so brief a narrative?

When we sat down to examine Dr. Davidson's work, we intended to have made his criticism of St. John's Gospel the main subject of our argument. But fallacy after fallacy arrested our eye before we could reach it. It is the last of the books of the New Testament which are criticised in his work. His denial of its historical character is all but total. We believe that his reasonings respecting it are equally fallacious with those which we have been occupied in exposing. But our space is nearly gone. We therefore trust that our readers have arrived at the same conclusion as ourselves—that the man who can esteem the fallacious arguments which we have been considering as possessing the smallest weight towards establishing his position, must be so devoid of sound logical judgment

as to deprive his opinion of all authority on any point of reasoning.

There is one point in connection with this subject to which we must draw attention before we close. Dr. Davidson not only takes up the extraordinary position respecting the Gospel of St. John, that it represents the humanity of its Jesus as something unreal and phantom-like, but for the purpose of assisting him in his proof of its late origin, he undertakes to show, from the style of the First Epistle of St. John, not only that the Apostle was not the author of it, but that it could not even have been composed by the same person who wrote the Fourth Gospel. This assertion we consider the greatest pyramid which the school of high criticism has attempted to erect upon its apex.

We quote Dr. Davidson's statement on this subject\*—“A notable example of the peculiarity to which we apply it, is the indistinct way in which the humanity of Christ is presented in this Gospel, the Docetic view being implied in several passages—vii. 30, viii. 59, x. 39, xviii. 6, and the un-Docetic in others. The narrative usually assigns to Jesus a shadowy ethereal body, while a few passages indicate a real structure of flesh and blood. The Gospel hovers between the two.”

We were inclined to doubt, when we read this passage, whether our eyes were not deceiving us. “The Docetic view,” *i.e.* the phantom character of our Lord's body, “being implied in several passages.” In proof of this, he refers to, but does not quote from, passages in this Gospel. We shall take the liberty of quoting them. John vii. 30 is—“They therefore sought to take Him, but no man laid hands on Him, because His hour was not yet come.” How this asserts the phantom-like character of our Lord's body, we are at a loss to conceive. John viii. 49—“They took up stones to cast at Him, but Jesus hid Himself (*ἐκρύβη*) and went out of the temple.” The same word (*ἐκρύβη*) occurs at xii. 36, where the evangelist says, “These words said Jesus, and departing, *hid Himself* from them.” Our readers should remark, that the addition in the Authorised Version, “going through the midst of them, and so passed by,” are rejected by the best critics as spurious. We ask Dr. Davidson, in all seriousness, whether these words imply the phantom-like character of our Lord's body more than Luke iv. 30, which describes His escape from the hands of the Nazarenes, when they attempted to cast Him headlong down the precipice, “And He going through the midst of

---

\* P. 355.

them, departed." The next passage referred to in proof of this position is John x. 39—"And they sought to take Him, but He escaped out of their hands." In order to make these words afford any proof of the phantom-like character of our Lord's body, it is necessary to take it for granted that they do so. The last passage referred to is John xviii. 6—"When therefore He said unto them, I am He, they went backwards and fell to the ground." How Dr. Davidson finds anything for his purpose here, is really beyond our comprehension, especially when we consider that within a few lines of the place where these words occur, the very same persons are represented as seizing Jesus and binding Him. It is so absolutely incomprehensible to us, how Dr. Davidson can have adduced these four passages in proof of his position, that the unpleasant suspicion has crossed our minds, that he must have calculated that his readers would be too idle to refer to them.

But this is not all. "The narrative," says he, "usually assigns to Jesus a shadowy-ethereal body—the outward resemblance of one, while a few passages indicate a real structure of flesh and blood." It seems, then, that the shadowy body is the rule, and the fleshly one is the exception. We hardly know how to express ourselves in reference to such a statement. Dr. Davidson cannot help knowing, that even if we put the most favourable construction on any passages which he can adduce, the result would be the reverse of the statement which he here makes. He will perhaps remind us of the miracle of Walking on the Sea, but we must beg him to remember that this miracle is reported by the other evangelists as well as by St. John. He has himself referred to the miracle of the Resurrection of Lazarus; and cannot have forgotten the fact that Jesus is there represented as having wept. The Synoptics contain only one incident so purely human, that recorded by St. Luke, His weeping over Jerusalem. Has he forgotten the scourging, the cross, and the grave, of this Gospel, the troubling of the Redeemer's soul at the Paschal table, or the incident of His girding Himself with a towel, and washing His disciples' feet? What does he want more to testify the writer's opinion of the presence of purely human flesh and blood? Is not the author careful to say, that he saw water and blood flow from the wound inflicted by the soldier's dart? He will tell us that some of the human scenes narrated in the Synoptics are wanting in this Gospel. Are not others, wanting there, present here? Has he forgotten the picture of the Redeemer sitting, wearied with

His journey, near the well at Sychar? But the agony in the garden is omitted. We reply, that that agony depicts before our eyes one of the grandest portraits of the Divine man. The fourth Gospel contains a less grand, but similar representation, the struggle of His soul recorded in His address to the Hellenists.

"The Gospel," says Dr. Davidson, "hovers between the two." What we have said, justifies us in meeting these words by a most emphatic denial.

Our author admits "that as far as external testimony goes, the authenticity of the First Epistle of St. John seems to be secure." He admits that it was known to Polycarp, Papias, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and a host of other later writers; that the great majority of these have actually quoted it as the production of the Apostle. "But," says he,\* "internal evidence is not favourable to Apostolic authorship. If John were alive at the time, the author, perhaps, wished to be considered that aged Apostle; if he were not, the intention may still have been to personate one so distinguished. The author of the Apocalypse could not have been the letter-writer. . . . The only question of importance that remains is, did the Epistle and the Fourth Gospel proceed from the same person?—a question which most answer in the affirmative, because the evidence of identity is plausible." After this admission, the reader will be surprised to hear Dr. Davidson's decision—"The deviations of the Epistle from the Gospel, though not numerous, are inconsistent with sameness of authorship."

For this decision he gives ten reasons, which, when we examine them, are of much the same weight as those which have induced him to assert that the author of the Gospel hovers on the border land of Docetism, and is more inclined to assign to Jesus a phantom body than a real one.

First, says he, the eschatology of the Epistle disagrees with that of the Evangelist. We have failed to discern any eschatology properly so called in the Evangelist at all. It is a strange thing, that if one writer mentions a thing which another omits to notice because it did not come within his plan, that such omission must prove difference of the authorship. We think this a very happy method for indefinitely multiplying the number of unknown authors. But Dr. Davidson will have it, that the eschatology of the Epistle contradicts the Gospel. To prove this, he says, "In the

---

\* P. 293.

Gospel, Christ's second advent is resolved into the Spirit's mission to the disciples." The only proof which we can discover of this is the old one, "*Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.*" In our ignorance, we have always read John xiv. 4 as a positive promise that He will come again.

Second. "There is no trace of Antichrist in the Gospel." Does not Dr. Davidson see that this is no contradiction? Might it not be adduced as a strong proof that the Gospel and the Epistle were written by the same person, that the idea of Antichrist is so prominent in the Epistle, that a forger of the Gospel would have been almost certain to have introduced it there, or *vice versa*? But the Epistle was intended for some definite persons. Might there not be special circumstances in the persons addressed which might have called forth the reference to an impending Antichrist?

Third. "The doctrine of a Paraclete distinct from Christ is wanting in the Epistle." To say that the application of this term in one place to the Spirit and in another to Christ in two short passages, proves difference of authorship, is mere trifling. The Epistle consists of five chapters; that portion of the Gospel where the Paraclete is mentioned of only three. The word Paraclete is of a rather wide signification, and equally applicable, when surveyed from different points of view, to Christ and the Spirit. Are we to suppose that either the Epistle or the Gospel contains the total of the writer's theology? Where is the contradiction between them?

Fourth. "Christ is not termed the *Logos* absolutely in the Epistle, as He is in the Gospel. He is the Life—the Eternal Life—which was with the Father, the Son of God, not the Word. High as the epithets are, they imply a conception of His Person inferior to the Gospel."

Not having a microscope of such magnifying power as Dr. Davidson habitually uses when he wishes to see anything in his own favour, we confess our inability to see the distinction. The terms used in the Epistle and the Gospel seem to us identically alike, making allowance for the difference of grammatical construction. The Gospel designates our Lord as the *Logos* and the true Light. It asserts that life was inherent in Him, that He existed in the beginning, and that the Word became flesh. The author of the Epistle states that the subject of the Epistle is, that which was from the beginning, 'Ο ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, concerning the *Word of Life*—περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, which he had heard, seen, looked on, and handled with his hands. The Life was manifested, and he had seen and borne witness of it. To infer from these, grammatical dif-



ference of authorship, more impeaches the soundness of our author's judgment than anything which we can say against it.

Fifth. "There is a subordinate polemic tendency in the Epistle, which is obviously anti-Docetic. The Gospel hovers on the borders of Docetism. This we have already shown to be contrary to fact.

Sixth. The length of this reason, and the purely arbitrary assumption on which it rests, render it needless for us to comment on it.

Seventh. "The representation of the Atonement, chaps. i. 7, ii. 2, iv. 10, of the Epistle is not the same as that of the Gospel, which does not speak of propitiation." We are utterly unable to see any real distinction between these passages and those of the Gospel, which speak of Christ giving Himself for the life of the world, united with its reiterated assertion that all spiritual life and holiness proceed from faith in His Person.

Eighth. "The distinction between venial and deadly sins is one unknown to the Gospels, and savours of a post-Apostolic time." We were first inclined to imagine that the word Gospels was a misprint for Gospel, supposing that the writer meant to confine his remarks to the Fourth Gospel; but the last clause of the sentence forbids it. We reply, therefore, that we think that the distinction between blasphemy against the Son, which is capable of forgiveness, and blasphemy against the Spirit, which is not, looks very like such a distinction; but if the author is speaking of the Gospel of St. John, we think that the words of our Lord, when He says to the Jews, "If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins," taken in their text and context, imply that the author of the Fourth Gospel was not quite ignorant of this distinction. Besides, if Dr. Davidson's reasoning proves anything, it proves that this Epistle was a forgery, subsequent to that of the fourth Gospel.

Ninth. "The attribute of light ascribed to God, who is also said to be in the light, is more materialistic than the conceptions of the Gospel concerning the Supreme." Here our patience fairly fails us, and we can only say—nonsense.

Tenth. The Epistle "has neither the tenderness nor the depth of the Gospel. It is weaker, and monotonous. In regard to energy, it is far beneath the great work which it most resembles," &c. All that Dr. Davidson here adduces is a matter of taste, and we beg to say that in our opinion his taste is far from infallible; and making allowance for the fact

that in the one case the speaker is our Divine Master, and in the other only the disciple whom Jesus loved, we beg entirely to differ from him, and to observe that if the Epistle was quite up, in point of elevation, to the utterances of the Gospel, it would be a strong presumption that the former was a forgery. Dr. Davidson is here again at his old work, taking for granted the very point which he ought to prove. To give the argument the smallest logical value, it is necessary to assume that the discourses of the Fourth Gospel are not utterances of our Lord, but inventions of its author.

Such are Dr. Davidson's reasons on the strength of which he sets aside the unanimous testimony of the early Church, and an amount of inward resemblance of thought and style such as will hardly be found elsewhere in any two writings on different subjects equally concise; and authoritatively pronounces that the author of the Epistle and the Fourth Gospel are two different persons. Let it be remembered that it is his business when he denies the authenticity of the writings of the New Testament, to make out a case against them. If the early Church was deceived in believing that they were authentic, let something like evidence be produced that such was the case. Let the reasonings be based on facts, and not on abstract theories. Let some evidence be adduced which rests on a rational foundation, and not on a mere guess, which rests for its plausibility on another guess, and that again on a third, or a fourth. Let the logic of criticism be laid down; let some definite canons be constructed, of which we can test their validity by extensive inductions from the great facts of history and the realities of life. Instead of doing this, Dr. Davidson allows himself to be made the prey of a number of *à priori* theories. Impelled by these, he rushes to the attack on the most important portions of the New Testament; and does his best to sap our belief in the historical foundation of our religion. To the evidence against him he is stone-blind. Like Don Quixote, he has pondered over German romances in connection with the Gospels till his intellectual vision has become so disordered, that he mistakes every straw for a cudgel, and fancies that with it he has stricken to the ground the Synoptics and St. John, the Acts, and eleven of the Epistles; whereas the real fact is that the straw has broken in his own hand, and he has mistaken its fracture for the overthrow of his opponents.

It is with deep regret that we feel obliged to write thus of Dr. Davidson's work. We believe that it will do what the author had not intended it to do, viz. sap the belief of many

in Christianity as a Divine revelation. We are ready to admit that the constitution of Dr. Davidson's mind is such, that he still continues to believe in Christianity after all his work of demolition; but we are assured that there are few who, in this respect, can follow his example. They may continue to view Jesus of Nazareth as the best of human teachers, but not as the Christ of God. Justice to Dr. Davidson requires that we should allow him to express himself on this most painful subject in his own words. The passage, which is in pages 39-41, vol. ii., is a long one. He must, therefore, excuse us from quoting more than the concluding words:—

“Not the less will they maintain that Christianity does not fall with the denial of the resurrection; especially as the fact is reported in a manner so contradictory, and susceptible of different interpretations. A theory surrounded with historical and other difficulties will not be made a corner-stone in the edifice. And they are right if the superior dignity of Jesus rests on His stainless conscience, His life of love and purity, His words of truth, His embodiment of the Father to mankind; if the glorious manifestation of the Divine love in a human person be the essence of His biography; if He be ‘the express image of the Almighty.’”

As we said at the commencement, we are prepared to admit Dr. Davidson's erudition; but his powers of reasoning and judgment are hopelessly at fault. We wish that we could honestly confine this condemnation to that portion of his work which we have had space to criticise. But we regret to say that we cannot. Reasonings equally baseless, and judgments equally rash, are profusely scattered over his volumes.

We would earnestly advise Dr. Davidson to reconsider his position, and to recall his work. Let him place it in the hands of a friend who possesses the power of logical reasoning and sound judgment, and ask him to strike out all the bad reasonings and arbitrary assumptions which he can find. We are persuaded that he will cross out half of the existing work. When this has been effected, Dr. Davidson, by the aid of his erudition, and the friend aided by the power of a “sound mind,” will produce a volume which will be as much increased in value, as it will have been decreased in bulk.

---

ART. II.—1. *Léopold I<sup>er</sup>, Roi des Belges. D'après des Documents inédits.* Par THEODORE JUSTE. G. Murquardt, Bruxelles. 1868.

2. *Memoirs of Leopold I., King of the Belgians.* From unpublished Documents. By THEODORE JUSTE. Authorised Translation, by Robert Black, M.A. Sampson Low, London. 1868.

3. *Reminiscences of the King of the Belgians.* Forming Appendix A to the "Early Years of H.R.H. the Prince Consort."

4. *Un Roi Constitutionnel. Leopold I<sup>er</sup>, Roi des Belges.* Par M. EMILE DE LAVELEYE. "Revue des deux Mondes," 15th January, 1869.

ON the 11th of April, 1814, had been signed the Treaty of Paris. Revolutionary France, after twenty-five years of military glory, and mostly of success, was defeated and humbled. The great captain, whose ambition a few months before had scarcely been satisfied with the dictatorship of the Continent, must perforce content himself with the petty sovereignty of Elba. It was the first real lull in the tempest that had raged since 1789—a lull looking like the settled calm of which it was only the presage—and England, which alone of European nations had refused to bend before the blast, was elate and happy. Whatever may be thought of the justice and expediency of her policy in commencing or continuing the Great War, there can be no question of her fortitude, and the honour she had won. It was with a legitimate and natural pride that in the summer of that year she welcomed the allied sovereigns of Russia and Prussia to her shores.

In the suite of the Emperor Alexander came a young general, on whose career that English visit exercised a marked influence. Leopold George Christian Frederick, Prince of Saxe-Coburg, the younger son of an impoverished German ducal family—himself, if contemporary report may be believed, poor in all but pedigree and connections—might easily, sagacious as he was, have passed through life without leaving his mark on European politics, or his name on the pages of history. But Leopold, the accepted suitor of the heiress to the throne

of Great Britain, became at once a person of note. He emerged from the group of minor, almost nameless, characters in the drama of this century, and joined the more prominent occupiers of the stage.

His previous life had been a chequered one. The times were bad indeed for reigning houses. More than proverbially uneasy lay the heads that wore a crown. French and Spanish Bourbons, Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns, all had suffered. Even in distant Muscovy the Romanoffs had wept over their blazing capital. And when these mightier pillars in the state system of Christendom had tottered or crumbled, scarcely was it to be expected that the slight tracery of minor potentates should escape uninjured. Leopold grew to manhood in the very midst of the falling ruins. He was born at Coburg, on the 16th of December, 1790; the youngest of six children. His grandmother, a princess of the house of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, wife of the reigning Duke, occupied the most prominent position in the family, and, indeed, in the state. "She ruled everything at Coburg," says her grandson, who was her great favourite, "and treated the little duchy as if it had been an empire." He adds, that "she was very generous, and in that respect did much harm, as she squandered the revenues in a dreadful manner."\* Much of the money thus spent during her own and her son's administration was lavished on the numerous emigrants from the adjacent states, driven into exile by the events consequent on the Revolution. War was raging everywhere around. Before he was sixteen, Leopold left home with his elder brother, Ernest, to join the Russian army in Moravia; but the French victory at Austerlitz, to use his own words, "put an end to it." In the ensuing year, 1806, the whole family abandoned Coburg, to escape, if possible, from the horrors of war and the marchings and counter-marchings of the French and Prussians. The precaution proved futile; Saalfeld, where they had taken refuge, became, owing to the "absurd position" adopted by "poor Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia," the very centre of a battle, while Coburg suffered no greater inconvenience than the passage of the Imperial troops. The Prussians were thoroughly defeated at Jena, and the whole of Germany fell into Napoleon's power.

"We returned," says Leopold, "as best we might, to Coburg. Towards the end of November, and the first days of December, our

---

\* See "Reminiscences of the King of the Belgians."

beloved\* benevolent father sank very fast, and died on the 9th of December, 1806. The situation was a sad one. The French had occupied but not yet seized Coburg, as our father was present. But after his death the question was immediately put—"Where is the new duke?" Hearing that he was with the King of Prussia, Coburg was taken possession of, and a military intendant took everything in hand. He was not an agreeable person; a M. Vilain, bearing well that name."

Fortunately he was soon replaced by a more gracious functionary; but still the state of affairs remained far from pleasant. "My good mother and all of us had no means of existence but what was clandestinely given by our employés, and a little tolerated by the Intendant." And while Leopold and his widowed mother were thus living almost on charity, his elder brother, the new duke, lay ill of typhus fever, at Koenigsberg. It was not till the following year that, by the Peace of Tilsitt, he was reinstated in his dominions.

In the autumn of 1808, Leopold, who, in the meantime, had visited Napoleon in Paris, made his *début* in diplomacy. He was summoned by the Emperor Alexander to the Congress of Erfurt. "I saw then a good deal of Napoleon," he says, "and should have succeeded in getting for my brother some territory if the Emperor Alexander had had more energy, and that my dear brother always asked a little too much." A couple of years later his efforts in the same direction met with more success. As he relates with pardonable pride: "In 1811, in the summer, not being yet twenty-one, I got my brother a very good treaty with Bavaria, in which Bavaria consented to divide with Coburg possessions which they had acquired in 1805."

Within twelve months the French legions were pouring through Germany on their way to Russia. Leopold had already had great difficulty in resisting Napoleon's invitation to enter the French service,† barely escaping by the good offices of Queen Hortense and "Old Josephine;" and now, fearing a renewal of wishes that were but too like commands, he escaped to Vienna, and thence into Italy. The French disaster recalled him. Germany, which had been reduced to a state almost of vassalage, was exulting at the defeat of her tyrant. Leopold and his brother went right and left, to Berlin,

\* Leopold never mentions his father without this epithet. These extracts are from the "Reminiscences" already quoted.

† Napoleon, in his conversations at St. Helena, gives a very different account of this matter. He represents Leopold as intensely anxious to obtain employment in the imperial staff.



to Vienna, to Munich, to fan the flame of resistance to the common foe. The service was one that required secrecy. Napoleon's arm, though shortened, was not paralysed, and Coburg was easily within its reach. This compelled the Duke to remain inactive at the commencement of the coming struggle. But Leopold made his way to Kalisch, in Poland, the head-quarters of the Emperor Alexander. As the first German Prince who had joined the liberating army, and, moreover, as a connection of the imperial house of Russia—his sister Anna Feodorowna had married the Grand Duke Constantine—he was well received, and immediately promoted to the rank of general. In this capacity he served with considerable distinction throughout the whole of the campaign, finally marching into Paris at the head of his corps of cavalry on the 31st of March, 1814.

Such, sketched in outline, had been the young prince's career up to the time when he first visited England in the suite of his imperial kinsman. Nor did four and twenty years thus spent constitute a bad political education. "The minute twaddle of those small establishments" is an expression which Leopold himself applies to the petty courts of Germany; and the description is confirmed, with an added tinge of coarseness and vulgarity, by Lord Malmesbury's diary of his mission to Brunswick, to fetch a wife for the Prince of Wales who afterwards became George IV. But empty gossip, formality, and dull routine must have vanished before such rude realities as invasion and ruin. Earnestly as Napoleon might endeavour to revive the splendid ceremonial of Versailles, and to surround himself with the same atmosphere of antique etiquette as Louis XIV., yet his own daring vitality acted like the most powerful of solvents on the courtly formalism of Europe. What was filigree that it should resist the power of such an engine? And Leopold had profited by the change. The best years of his youth had not been wasted in lounging about the palace of a small principality. He had been brought into contact with some of the ablest politicians of the time, and enjoyed an opportunity of practically studying how the world's affairs are conducted; he had been forced to battle in diplomatic strife for the interests of his family; had travelled somewhat, and seen much; had served no carpet-knight's apprenticeship in actual warfare, and last, certainly not least, had felt the bracing influences of adversity. There can be little doubt that to the varied experiences of these younger days Leopold owed much of that practical sagacity, that tact in dealing with men, for which he afterwards acquired so just a reputation.

The English Court to which the allies were welcomed was not in the most creditable of conditions. George III. was lying mad at Windsor under the care of Queen Charlotte, and the Prince Regent reigned in his stead. Of that vice-monarch what is there to be said that has not been said a hundred times before? In his own day he was counted for a gentleman—nay, for the first gentleman in Europe—and the opinion was held by men who were not parasites and courtiers. But since prestige of his exalted position and some charm of manner that must have really existed were laid with him in the grave, the darker colours have prevailed in his portraits. We all remember that drawn by our own great satirist: Thackeray's George is a terrible picture. And of his wife, whose wrongs so stirred the hearts of our fathers fifty years ago, there is but little better to be said. Even taking her husband's unpopularity and open profligacy into account, it is difficult now in cold blood to understand the enthusiasm she and her cause had power to kindle. Nor is it an easy task, it would scarcely be a profitable one, to effect a nice adjustment of the balance of wrong between the two.

The Princess Charlotte, the only child of this ill-starred royal marriage, was born on the 7th of January, 1796. With such a parentage, her earlier years could have scant promise of happiness. When scarcely more than a year old, her father and mother had agreed to live apart; before her childhood had passed, they were at bitter enmity, each striving to poison her mind against the other. In this unseemly struggle the husband had outwardly the manifest advantage. To him it belonged to make every arrangement for the education of the daughter. He could settle that that education should not be entrusted to the mother. He had the power to place what restraint he chose upon any intercourse between the two. But the very extent and fulness of this authority rendered extreme tact and delicacy in its exercise imperative. Even influence of the gentlest kind would be resented, as coercion, and real coercion would be followed by open revolt. And these results, probable in any case, became almost inevitable with a character like that of the Princess Charlotte. For the girl possessed a high and resolute spirit, that could ill brook interference or injustice. George, accustomed to submission and flattery, had neither self-command nor skill to deal successfully with her. His coarse paternal disportism only drove her nearer to her mother's side—only made her the more determined to take her mother's part. Nor in default of filial respect was there any natural affinity of disposition

between the daughter and her father. His artificiality must have been pre-eminently distasteful to her. She inherited much more of her mother's character. The eccentricity and habitual disregard of conventionality, and even of decorum, which existed to so painful a degree in Caroline, were tempered indeed in Charlotte till they became no more than a pleasing spontaneity and naturalness of heart and manner; but the qualities were the same in kind, though differing in degree as light from darkness. Thus the child's heart was drawn towards the mother, even though there was a great deal in her conduct of which, as she grew up, she could not approve. "She loved her very much," says Leopold, adding, however, with some significance, "though she knew her well."

When the Princess was no more than seventeen, a suitor for her hand appeared, in the person of the Prince of Orange. He came with the approval—nay, at the invitation—of the Regent; and though the royal message on the subject, daily expected by Parliament, was still delayed, no one doubted that his suit would be successful. Charlotte herself seems for some time to have regarded him with favour. But ere long difficulties arose, and the match was broken off. The Duke of Buckingham, in his *Memoirs of the Court of England*, during the Regency, attributes this failure to Russian intrigue.\* According to him, the Emperor Alexander, desirous of securing the Prince for a Russian princess, sent over his sister, the wily Grand Duchess of Oldenburg, who ingratiated herself with Caroline, and through Caroline with Charlotte, and thus effected the desired rupture. It may be so, though the date of the publication of the Duke's book inclines us to regard the story of this dark plot with some slight suspicion, for in 1856 men were more prone than they are now to attribute importance to Russian intrigues. And independently of such external influences, there is quite enough in the known circumstances of the case to account for the rejection of the Dutch prince. Charlotte, as we have said, strongly took her mother's part in the domestic quarrel of her parents. He as strongly espoused the other side, and is even said to have declared that Caroline should never enter any house of his. This difference on a subject so important must have nipped all mutual confidence in the bud; and the Princess had probably seen too much of the miseries of a marriage without affection, to care that her own youth should wither in so chill an atmosphere. It was

---

\* See vol. ii. p. 86.

while this projected union was falling through, that the Princess Charlotte first met Leopold at the apartments of the Grand Duchess of Oldenburg.\* His manly beauty,† his bearing at once noble and modest, his military prowess, all conspired to produce a strong impression on her heart, and she fell very really in love with him. Her mother, who was on intimate terms with the Grand Duchess, lent him the aid of her parental influence. "The majority of the public," as he himself says, "were favourable to me—even ministers—particularly the Wellesley family, Lord Castle-reagh, &c." The Regent, greatly indignant at the rejection of his own candidate, and apparently, also, at the preference of a rival supported by his detested wife, determined on open hostilities. On the 10th of July, 1814, he made that sudden raid on the Princess's establishment at Warwick House which she eluded by the famous hackney-coach flight to her mother's residence in Connaught-place. Leopold's position between them all must have been a most difficult one. But he steered clear of rocks and quicksands with his usual skill, and before he left London at the end of the same month, "he was," in his own words, "graciously received by the Regent, who had verified that no unfair intrigue had taken place."

His first duty on reaching Germany was to "settle the guardianship" of his sister, the Princess of Leiningen—afterwards Duchess of Kent, and mother of our Queen—who had just been left a widow. Thence, he went to the Congress at Vienna, where he again did diplomatic service for his brother. While there "the Duke of Kent was so kind as to favour some communications with Princess Charlotte, who expressed her determination to remain firm in her plans." Napoleon's return from Elba again necessitating a recourse to arms, Leopold resumed his command in the Russian army. His division of light cavalry did not, however, reach the scene of actual conflict. He was not present at Waterloo. At Paris the Duke of Kent's kind offices were again brought into requisition. "The Princess and her friends wished the Prince to go to England. He was, however, of opinion that the

---

\* The Prince himself occupied what he described as "a rather indifferent lodging," provided for him by the Russian Ambassador in High Street, Marylebone. His income at that time is stated not to have been more than £400 a year.

† It was mentioned to Napoleon at St. Helena that the Princess had been greatly struck with Leopold, and had selected him of her own free choice. He observed: "I can easily believe it, for, if I remember rightly, he was the handsomest young man I saw at the Tuileries." And certainly there were many "proper men" in Napoleon's military court.

Princess's father should not be braved, as it would render things more difficult. The Princess thought this an excess of discretion, and was not pleased; but after events proved that the forbearance had been wise." Most certainly; for in the following January, Leopold received at Berlin a formal invitation from the Regent, and forthwith hastened to London with such speed as a most inopportune "inflammatory cold" and terrible weather would allow. More time was spent in formalities than was quite agreeable to the impatience of the happy bridegroom, but very fortunately the Princess of Wales had taken herself abroad ere this, so that the difficulties were of form merely, and unenvenomed by angry feeling. At last, on the 2nd of May, 1816, the loving pair were united at Carlton House.

Parliament had granted them an allowance of £60,000 a year, with £50,000 for an outfit;\* and after inspecting several other estates, the Prince and Princess finally settled at Claremont. Their married life was without a cloud. It offered to the people of England a spectacle too rare at that time—though we, of this later generation, have seen an example equally conspicuous and fortunately less transitory—the spectacle of a happy royal home. They "gained the love and admiration of all who came within their influence," says the Duke of Buckingham. But, alas, the threadbare moral of preacher and poet is a dreadful reality:—

"O trustlesse state of miserable men,

That build your blisse on hope of earthly thing."

Scarce eighteen months had elapsed when Death remorselessly shattered all this happiness. On the 5th of November, 1817, the Princess was delivered, after an unusually protracted labour, of a still-born son. The physician—he paid to himself an awful penalty for his want of nerve—seems to have been unequal to his duties. She sank from exhaustion early on the following morning.

There are many now living who can remember the thrill of grief with which the news of that death was received throughout the country. It was one of those rare occasions when a public calamity is felt like a private loss. The Princess Charlotte had endeared herself to the whole people. They loved her for her genuineness, for her fine open nature and strong vitality. There was no question here, as in the case of

---

\* If the Prince survived the Princess he was to receive a pension of £50,000. This pension he resigned on accepting the crown of Belgium.

her royal father, of "waistcoats and under waistcoats, and then nothing." A true heart beat beneath the princely satins, however fine and costly. Her soul was unstified by the swathing bands of etiquette. Even her faults were of the popular kind, and won her favour. And thus she was loved for the contrast she presented to her father, loved for the ardour with which she had espoused her mother's part, loved even for the happiness of her married life—loved, perhaps most, for the beauty of a kind heart and of gracious deeds.

With a very touching brevity does Leopold refer to this dark passage in his life. In the "Reminiscences," written forty-five years after the Princess Charlotte had been laid in the grave, and nearly at the close of a most successful career, he says: "November saw the ruin of this happy home, and the destruction at one blow of every hope and happiness of Prince Leopold. He has never recovered the feeling of happiness which had blessed his short married life."

The events of the next two or three years shall be told in his own words, as some of the details are characteristic and interesting:—

"1818 was passed in retirement by Prince Leopold, who only saw some members of the royal family. The Duke and Duchess of Kent resided most of the time at Claremont. In September, Prince Leopold went by Switzerland to see his sister to Coburg, where he remained till the beginning of May, 1819, when he returned by Paris to England, where his sister had been happily confined.

"The Regent was not kind to his brother. At every instant something or other of an unpleasant nature arose. The Duke and Duchess resided repeatedly at Claremont. Prince Leopold made in August an excursion to Scotland, and through various parts or England. He received everywhere the most enthusiastic welcome. The Regent was not pleased with this journey. The Duke and Duchess of Kent came to Claremont after the Prince's return, and remained there till he went to Sidmouth, where the Duke hoped to escape the winter, which had set in with unusual severity even in November, when thick ice was everywhere to be seen. 1820, Prince Leopold was at Lord Craven's, when the news arrived that a cold which the Duke got at Salisbury, visiting the Cathedral, had become alarming. Soon after the Prince's arrival, the Duke breathed his last. The Duchess, who lost a most amiable and devoted husband, was in a state of the greatest distress. It was fortunate that Prince Leopold had not been out of the country, as the poor Duke had left his family deprived of all means of existence. The journey to Kensington was most painful, and the weather, at the same time, very severe. It had been the opinion of many people that the Duchess ought, first of all, to have taken possession of Kensington. King George III.



died almost at the same moment as his son. King George IV. showed himself, at the first moment, very affable to Prince Leopold, which line of conduct was in view of what might happen concerning the now Queen Caroline. Her arrival in June threw the whole country into confusion. Prince Leopold's position became unbearably distressing between the King and the Queen Caroline. A severe illness of his mother, the dowager Duchess of Coburg, would have given a colour to his leaving England, to keep out of the painful struggle which was going on; it was much wished by the King, who employed Lord Lauderdale in this sad affair, but how abandon entirely the mother of Princess Charlotte, who, though she knew her mother well, loved her very much? The Prince determined not to interfere till the evidence against the Queen should be closed, so that whatever he might do could not influence the evidence. This decision was evidently the most honest and the most impartial. He waited till the evidence was closed, and then paid a visit to his mother-in-law at Brandenburg House. She received him kindly; looked very strange, and said strange things. The country was in a state of incredible excitement, and this visit was a great card for the Queen. It had an effect on the lords which it ought not to have had, as it could not change the evidence, but it is certain that many lords changed, and ministers came to the certainty that the proceedings could not be carried further. They proposed that the measure should be given up. The King, who had been, it must be confessed, much maltreated during this sad trial, was furious, and particularly against Prince Leopold. He never forgave it, being very vindictive, though he occasionally showed kinder sentiments, particularly during Mr. Canning's being minister. He, of course, at first declared that he would never see the Prince again. However, the Duke of York arranged an interview. The King could not resist his curiosity, and got Prince Leopold to tell him how Queen Caroline was dressed, and all sorts of details."—*Reminiscences, &c.*, page 389.

As early as 1825, the insurgent Greeks had sounded Leopold with a view to ascertain whether he would consent to become their king; and on the 3rd of February, 1830, the three Powers, England, France, and Russia, that had taken Greece under their protection, and compelled Turkey to acknowledge her independence, made him a formal offer of the crown. He accepted it, but only on condition that the people themselves should freely acknowledge his sovereignty; that Candia and the Ionian Islands should form part of the new state; that the very unsatisfactory northern frontier should be rectified, and that the three Powers should guarantee a loan to be immediately raised. This last condition, owing to his great personal exertions, was fulfilled; but on the question of frontier and of increased territory, he was unable to obtain any

satisfaction, and he unhesitatingly refused to place himself at the head of a people unsettled, discontented, and justly indignant. It did not suit him to appear before the Greeks as a kind of delegate commissioned by the Great Powers to see to their good behaviour, and repress their national aspirations. "Such a mission," he said, "would be as contrary to my sentiments as injurious to my character." This determination, however, was very badly received by the ardent Philhellenes of the time; and even Leopold's friend, the illustrious Baron von Stein, spoke in very bitter terms of the pusillanimity with which he had withdrawn his hand from the plough. That the Prince was right in his demands there can be now no doubt. Very shortly after these negotiations, a frontier line such as he himself had suggested was agreed to. England, a few years ago, ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece, and might just as well have done so in 1830. And as regards Candia, the fact that it has remained in the hands of Turkey is the chief cause of the present incident in the complications in the East. Whether Leopold, by the exercise of a very little patience and that diplomatic skill which he shortly afterwards displayed in very analogous circumstances, might not have secured all these objects even then, is a question. That he himself, one of the best judges in such matters, thought not, is, however, a very strong argument to the contrary. But of this there is no room whatever for doubt—that his determination was one which the Greeks had, and will long have, bitter cause to regret. King Otho was very far from being a Leopold.

It is worth recording, that there was one person who rejoiced unfeignedly over the abandonment of the Greek project: "The Queen well remembers her joy when this took place, as she adored her uncle, and was in despair at the thought of his departure for Greece."

Very shortly after Leopold had thus, with a disinterestedness that rather astonished many of his contemporaries, refused the proffered crown, a similar overture was made from another quarter. By the Treaties of Paris and London, in 1814, and of Vienna, in 1815, Belgium had been annexed to Holland, and the State thus formed under the title of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, assigned to William of Orange. In making this arrangement, it had not been intended that either country should exercise any supremacy, or possess any advantage over the other. They were henceforward to constitute one homogeneous whole—the constitution of Holland being modified and enlarged to meet the requirements of the

larger state. All this might look well in theory, but in practice it was an almost impossible task to combine elements so essentially discordant. The two countries had nothing in common. The Dutch were justly proud of their history. They remembered the heroic struggles in which their forefathers had defeated the whole power of Spain, baffled the attacks of Louis XIV., and contested with England the supremacy of the sea. They loved the Protestantism that had earned for their land a glorious independence of two hundred years, and given it the energy to play so important a part in the affairs of Europe. They felt, not unnaturally perhaps, a kind of moral superiority over the southern provinces that had never shaken themselves free of a foreign yoke, or enjoyed a separate existence. The Belgians, on the other hand, were strong in numbers,\* ardent in their devotion to the Roman Catholic Church, and very jealous of their newly acquired liberty. From the first dissensions broke out. The modified constitution was rejected by a majority of the southern "notables." The King, to whom that constitution assigned a most undue share of power, nevertheless, made it appear by trick and *finesse* that the votes were favourable. This was a bad beginning. It was followed by an unwise prosecution of M. de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, for having protested on religious grounds against the new polity and by laws directed against the right dearest to the Roman clergy, the right of sectarian education. As if in very wantonness, it was decreed that Dutch was the language of the country, and that, henceforward, no one who could not speak it should be appointed to any public office. The Dutch, consequently, nearly monopolised the Government appointments. The press was persecuted. Taxation was unequally distributed, and weighed unduly on the southern provinces. Nor did the constitution, in its regular working, afford much hope of redress. The King, to whom it belonged to originate all laws, made an open profession of despotic principles. The upper chamber was nominated by him; the lower was elected in equal proportions by the north and south, though the southern population, as we have said, was far more numerous, and the Dutch deputies, to a man, voted with the Government.

Such is but a very brief epitome of the Belgian grievances during the fifteen years from 1815 to 1830. Doubtless those grievances were in many respects exaggerated. Doubtless,

---

\* The population of the southern provinces was considerably larger than that of the northern.

also, there was a Dutch side on most of these questions. But of course that side was not the one visible to the Belgians. The national feeling and mutual forbearance engendered by a common history and common associations, are almost indispensable to the working of a popular government. Without sentiment the wheels of politics are apt to grate.

It does not seem that King William I. had any appreciation whatever of the arduous nature of the task he had to perform. Then, as now, Belgium was divided into two hostile parties—the Liberals and the Catholics. Had he played one against the other, he might, perhaps, have subdued each successively. With singular imprudence he simultaneously offended both. His blows welded them together. All differences merged in a national opposition to him. The discontent was universal. At first it sought redress in strictly legal ways, by petitions, and parliamentary oratory and newspaper articles. But in 1830 there arose one of those sudden storms that periodically sweep over Europe. During three July days revolution raged in Paris, and on the fourth the elder branch of the Bourbons had lost the throne of France. Brussels was not slow to follow this example. On the night of the 25th of the following August—animated, it is said, by a stirring performance of the opera of *Massaniello*—the people of that city rose in arms and expelled the royal troops. Prince Frederick, the King's son, marched against the insurgents. On the 23rd of September he took possession of the Park. After three days' hard fighting he was dislodged, and the exulting citizens watched his retreat towards Mechlin. The other towns followed swiftly in the footsteps of the capital. Very soon, in all his Belgian provinces, there were only two or three fortresses which William I. could call his own. In the beginning of November the representatives of the Great Powers—France, England, Austria, Russia and Prussia—met in London, at his request, to consider the questions at issue between the combatants. An armistice was the almost immediate result.

To the Provisional Government that had assumed the reins of power, and to the National Congress that met almost immediately, belonged the difficult task of framing a constitution for the young state, and of placing that constitution in working order. A republic was not to be thought of. The name still stank in the nostrils of Europe. And if a monarchy was inevitable, who was to be king? There were several candidates more or less eligible—the Duke de Nemours, son of King Louis Philippe; Duke Augustus of Leuchtenberg, son

of Eugène de Beauharnais, Napoleon's step-son; Prince Otho, of Bavaria, afterwards King of Greece; and Prince Leopold. Of these the first was actually elected; but the French King, with his usual wily caution, refused to incur the hostility of the Great Powers by consenting to the suspicious aggrandisement of his own family. Finally, after negotiations which must have seemed interminable to a country possessing neither settled boundaries nor a regular government, Leopold was, on the 1st of June, 1831, elected king by a majority of 152 out of 196 votes. It was a noteworthy sign of the patriotic union then existing between Catholics and Liberals, that both parties should have concurred in the choice of a Protestant prince. Great praise is specially due to the many Catholic ecclesiastics who could so far soar above the prejudices of their order as to speak and vote in his favour.

Before proceeding to the election, the National Congress had naturally taken steps to ascertain whether Leopold would accept the offered crown. He had replied with his habitual circumspection. The Constitution did not altogether please him.

" 'It is very evident,' said he one day, with a smile, to the delegates of the Congress, 'that royalty was not present to defend itself, for you have treated it rather roughly. Your Charter is very democratic. Still I think that with a good will on either side we shall be able to get on.' "

He was, therefore, prepared to set this difficulty to one side. But a far more serious obstacle, as in the former case of Greece, was the question of territory. Belgium considered that the Duchies of Luxemburg and Limburg ought to remain in her possession. The Dutch naturally did not concur in this view; and European diplomacy leant rather to their side. Leopold, as before, did not wish that one of the first acts of his reign should be the ratification of measures humiliating to the country over which he was called to rule. Nevertheless, when the "Treaty of the Eighteen Articles," settling the preliminaries of a peace between Holland and Belgium, had been signed by the Great Powers, and accepted by the Belgian Congress, he hesitated no longer. Without waiting for the adhesion of the Dutch Government, he started from London on the 16th of July, 1831, crossed from Dover to Calais, and on the following day entered his new dominions amid the acclamations of the whole people.

Scant time was allowed for festivities. On the 2nd of August the Commandant of the Citadel at Antwerp announced

that hostilities would be resumed on the 4th. Holland refused to be bound by the treaty. Both France and England were prompt in their offers of assistance. But the Belgians, dreading the presence of French troops, and eager to uphold the military honour of their country, induced Leopold, against his better judgment, to refuse all help, and to march single-handed against the invaders. The result might have been expected. Belgium had had no time to organise an army. Her troops were out-numbered and undisciplined. Notwithstanding the king's personal exertions, they were defeated; and, without the prompt intervention of Lord William Russell, and the rapid advance of the French, Brussels would again have fallen into the hands of the Dutch. Leopold had lost neither honour nor popularity in this short campaign; but he long regretted its results. "It still gives me daily a terrible amount of trouble," said he two years afterwards. "I would give much to be able to start again from the 2nd of August." The military prestige of his adopted country had received a rude shock. The King of Holland was naturally emboldened by the manifest weakness of his antagonists. In the subsequent negotiations Belgium lost a great part of Luxemburg and Limburg.

Into the history of those negotiations, however, it is not our intention to enter. Neither shall we linger over the details of Belgium's external policy during the reign of Leopold. For M. Théodore Juste, a Belgian historian, addressing a Belgian public, these things possess an interest which we naturally cannot feel in the same degree. To those French writers, on the other hand, whether Liberal or Imperial, who have treated of Leopold's career, the subject is chiefly interesting from the light it may throw on contemporary French history. They endeavour, from different points of view, to show why constitutional government, which succeeded so well in a neighbouring country, failed so miserably in their own.\* Such are not the topics which would attract our attention in a life of the Belgian monarch. What we should like to study would be the man himself—the man who through a long life plays so important and so successful a part in the affairs of Europe. Regarded in this aspect, M. Juste's book is scarcely satisfactory, and our legitimate curiosity remains unsatisfied. Not that we blame him for it.

---

\* See, for instance, M. de Laveleye in the *Revue du deux Mondes* for the 15th of January, 1869; and M. de la Guéronnière in his *Etudes et Portraits, politique contemporains* (Paris, 1856).



Perhaps the materials for such a biography as we should wish to possess are not yet accessible. The only critical objection we will make to his interesting work relates to his undue partiality for speeches made on official occasions. The oracular sentences uttered by a monarch at the opening of parliament, for instance, are not generally of much historical or biographical value. Of M. Juste's translator we must, unfortunately, speak more severely. His version is generally pretty correct, certainly—though, here and there, he falls into curious mistakes\*—but it is quite inartistic. Thoroughly to recast French into English is a more difficult task than is usually supposed. There are, however, worse sins in the book before us—two notably against good taste, as when in a note he perpetrates the very small joke of saying that Shakespeare “has been called a ‘clayver man’”—and again, when he quotes a verse of irrelevant doggerel in his Introduction. These witticisms are little better than buffoonery, and quite out of place in a sober historical work. Moreover, Mr. Black, like many greater men, has been lured into absurdity by the *ignis fatuus* of logical consistency. He adopts a theory that because certain proper names are habitually translated, therefore all proper names should be rendered into English. Among the results are such monstrosities as *Mary Antonietta*. Macaulay was wont to speak of *Lewis XIV.*, but even his purism would have recoiled before anything so ugly. And, alas, Mr. Black's consistency is only skin deep. *Louisa* is not an uncommon English name. Why then should *Mary Louise* retain her foreign appellation? And the *Louis* in *Louis Philip* might really be turned into *Lewis*. However, when names only are concerned, their being tricked out in a new dress is only harmlessly amusing. But the translation of the title of a book or journal—the original title not being also given—is a positive nuisance, and greatly adds to the difficulty of reference. The fact is, in all such matters “rule of thumb” and common sense are much better guides than logic.

Though, however, as we have said, M. Juste is very sparing of all personal details and characteristic anecdotes, yet his Introduction contains a few pages descriptive of Leopold's manner of life which are worth quoting:—

“Leopold I., true king as he was in public, was personally far from exacting. His style of living reminded one of the simple and

\* As when, for instance, he renders *le génie militaire*—“military genius,” instead of “the military engineers.”

somewhat ruffle habits of Germany. Simplicity was conspicuous in his manners and language, as well as in his way of life: he was reserved, no doubt, but he did not affect haughtiness, just as he did not study luxury. A few chairs in covers of a light colour, white curtains, and some small but high tables, at which he wrote standing, formed the furniture of the apartments he inhabited at Brussels, at Laeken, at Ardenne, and at the Guilia Villa on the Lake of Como. The same simplicity distinguished his dress: he nearly always, however, wore his uniform of general.

"He rose early at all seasons, winter and summer, and worked until two o'clock, only leaving off to take a few turns in the garden before breakfast.\* State affairs had the precedence. He examined them with great assiduity and regularity; and it was hardly so much as three days before his death that he ceased to attend to them. During the long illness which carried him to the grave, and even amidst the most painful crisis, he only once put off—for four and twenty hours—the signing of the papers which were in regular course submitted to him. Every day, after having despatched affairs of state, he devoted himself to study. He had always about him an enormous number of works of every kind, and in all languages, for he read fluently French, German, English, Russian, Italian, Spanish, and Flemish.

"His librarians had directions to keep him acquainted with the principal novelties. Every Sunday these new books were examined, and the king immediately made his selection. History, fine arts, ethnography, travels, botany, agriculture—all branches of science occupied his attention. All his life he had an inclination for novel-reading; he always had one begun upon his table, and to his last day he never ceased to take a lively pleasure in this kind of reading. In this domain of literature no striking work ever appeared without being submitted to him; and the fugitive and laconic hits (notes?) jotted down daily in his diary showed great delicacy of taste and a vivid imagination.

"This freshness of his in mind and impressions disclosed itself on every occasion. He enjoyed the beauties of nature in the spirit of a real poet.

"The last time he retired to the Guilia Villa, it was with a sort of enthusiasm that he saw once more the neighbourhood of the Alps. He had alighted from his carriage, and as he walked along the road he stopped every moment in an ecstasy which might be termed juvenile. He communicated his impressions to those who surrounded him, delighting as he did to investigate in presence of Nature's grandeur the grand problem of the creation." . . .

"Next to reading, the King's chief recreation was walking. He held the opinion of Lord Palmerston, whom he often quoted, and who had said to him that a man, to be well, needed four hours' open

---

\* Equivalent to the English lunch.

air a day. In his latter days he had given up his horse,\* although he had been an accomplished rider, but he had not relinquished hunting. He liked to scour the noble plains which lie by the Castle of Ardenne, and to track the wolf and the wild boar in the forests of St. Hubert.

"He had always shown a special taste for botany, and, in his later years, he had bestowed much attention upon astronomy.

"He generally dined alone, and late. After dinner he liked to make up a family card-party. Being himself a distinguished musician, he had a great fondness for the art adorned by Mozart, Beethoven, Rossini, and Meyerbeer: to the very end of his life he had some of the chief works of the great masters performed nearly every day by his own pianist at the Castle of Læken." . . .

"His memory, let me repeat, was remarkable. He was especially retentive of anecdotes, and he related them with a perfectly English humour, which added a greatest charm to his conversation."

We have seen that when the crown of Belgium was offered to Leopold, he felt some doubt whether the position assigned to him by the Constitution was tenable. It speaks volumes for his prudence and good sense that during the whole of his long reign the difficulties of that position never once placed him in serious collision with the Legislature or the country, never once impaired his just popularity. He owed this result, in a great measure, to the perfect estimate he had formed of his duties as a constitutional monarch. We, in England, since her Majesty ascended the throne, have been so accustomed to see the sovereign holding aloof from the strife of party and leaving the ministry in undisputed possession of power, that we are apt perhaps to forget how recent is this total abstinence on the part of royalty. Certainly it was exercised neither by William IV., George IV., nor their royal father. But even before our Queen had adopted this line of conduct, Leopold was consistently following it in Belgium. Perhaps, it is not too much to assume that his niece and nephew had learnt part at least of the lesson of wisdom from him."

"Never," writes M. de Laveleye, "could anyone say that he favoured one party more than the other. . . . Having to act in concert with men of two opposite parties, he studiously avoided everything that might render his relations with either less easy. In his heart to which side did he incline? No word spoken by him, no writing which he has left, reveals it. His Tory instincts, his reminiscences as a German Prince, probably inclined him towards the

---

\* Mr. Black means that "he gave up riding." It must be understood that he is responsible for the translation of this extract.

Catholics, who, to his eyes, must have represented the Conservative and aristocratic party. But his clear-sightedness made him perceive that the principles of Liberalism are better adapted to the requirements of our time."

It is worth noticing in these days of transition that though on such excellent terms with the contending chiefs, Leopold was extremely averse to any confusion of party. Catholics he thought should be Catholics; and Liberals, Liberals. Without a well-defined line of difference between the party in power, and the opposition, Parliamentary government could not be carried on.

We shall quote but one incident illustrative of his wisdom in the management of internal affairs. On the 31st of March, 1846, M. de Theux succeeded in forming a Catholic ministry. The Liberals immediately took measures to attack it. A *Liberal Congress*, composed of delegates from the provinces and the metropolis, was convened in Brussels. "The bare announcement of this assembly exasperated, alarmed, and stupefied Louis Philippe." His head filled with reminiscences of the part played during the great Revolution by the clubs and the *Commune* of Paris. He wrote in hot haste to Leopold, exhorting him not to allow the Congress to meet, and offering any help that might be necessary to quell so insurrectionary a movement. He was aghast to think that such a mine might be sprung so close to France. In words presageful of his own ruin he conjured the Belgian King to "keep his present ministry, uphold it as vigorously as you can. Nothing could be better calculated to bring everything about our ears than a ministerial crisis, and especially than the appointment of a ministry composed of the delegates, their adherents, or those of the same political hue." Alas! how little had Louis Philippe profited by his vast experience! The three hundred delegates met in the most orderly manner, undisturbed by any act of Leopold. Their cause was successful at the next general election. A ministry representing their views came into power. And while Louis Philippe was atoning for his obstinate conservatism by deposition and exile, Leopold was riding out the revolutionary storm safe in the affection of his people.

If, however, the King of Belgium was almost uniformly wise in his measures of internal government, it was even more by his great diplomatic skill that he won his world-wide fame. Never had nature and circumstance more evidently combined to form an accomplished diplomatist. Gifted

with a shrewd intellect, his life had been passed among great statesmen. He had travelled much, and was familiar with most of the courts of Christendom. Even in the beginning of his reign he could say, with truth, "I know Europe and the masks that govern it better than Louis Philippe's ministers." In his later years he was called the Nestor of Europe; and his arbitration was requested in more than one international quarrel—notably in our differences with Brazil.\* It was universally felt that nowhere could be found a judge at once so competent and impartial. As a statesman he belonged to the old school of diplomatists—the school that entertained an almost superstitious veneration for the balance of power, and whose tools were caution and common sense, rather than dash and originality. His strategy, like that of the generals who marched and countermarched over Europe before Napoleon revolutionised the art of war, was one of slow advances and prudent retreats, of certain if not very brilliant successes. The daring schemes so marvellously realised by a Napoleon III. or a Bismarck, would never have entered into his brain. There was nothing of the visionary or adventurer about him. His understanding was pre-eminently calm and solid. When, in October, 1831, the Conference of London had decided on restoring a large part of Luxemburg and Limburg to Holland, he was fully determined to abdicate if Belgium did not accept that decision. When, however, seven years afterwards, the same question again presented itself, he was eager in his resistance.† His army had been reorganised in the meanwhile, and he was anxious, by a successful campaign against Holland, to retrieve the military honour of the country. Scarce could the opposition of all the Powers restrain him from war. In later years his influence was ever exercised on the side of peace. He thought that in the interests of Belgium—a young small state, weak in natural defences, and poised, as it were, upon the goodwill of the great Powers—any serious European convulsion was very dangerous. He at first deprecated the Russian war. The Italian campaign excited his gravest apprehensions. "They talk," said he, "of *localising*; that is all very well, but victory in its effects cannot be localised." So, too, he regretted the invasion of Denmark. It is said that, with

\* It shows his impartiality that, though England was the pivot of his external policy, he should have given his verdict in favour of Brazil.

† Holland refused to accept the decision of the Conference till 1838, so that the treaty was not actually executed till then.

his usual wisdom, he prophesied evil of the ill-fated Mexican Expedition, in which his son-in-law lost his life and his daughter her reason.

When Leopold accepted the crown of Belgium, a union with a princess of the house of Orleans was strongly desired both by himself and by his people. They deemed that this would be the clearest evidence that the French Government harboured no sinister designs against their country. Accordingly, proposals were made in due form and accepted, and on the 9th of August, 1832, Leopold was married at Compiègne to the Princess Louise, daughter of King Louis Philippe. By this marriage he had four children—a son, born on the 24th of July, 1833, who died on the 16th of the following May; another son, who now wears his father's crown, under the title of Leopold II.; a third son, the Count of Flanders, and a daughter, another Princess Charlotte, the story of whose sorrows and madness still lingers in all our memories.

Though Leopold's second marriage was not so entirely one of affection as the first, yet in his second wife he was again greatly blest. He wished her to take a prominent part in public affairs, and her "exquisite judgment" and cultured intellect would have enabled her to do so with effect, but her natural modesty impelled her generally to keep aloof from politics.

"Her policy," says a writer in the *Revue Française* quoted by M. Juste, "was her beneficence. She busied herself about clothing the poor. It was not that she took no interest in public questions, reading many books, reviews, newspapers, and all important publications, but she kept in the background. She was a prodigal from charity. Sometimes her mother scolded her for it, and she, in 1846, being then a woman of thirty-four, and a queen, promised to be more economical for the future; then, with a charming timidity, and a touching backward glance at the things of the past, she sought to excuse herself by saying, that her purse was better filled now than it used to be."

She died at Ostend, on the 11th of October, 1850, and we well remember the grief shown by the country at her loss. We well remember also the funeral procession that escorted her to her long home. It was a dull October day. At the point where the road from Brussels intersects the railway, the car was removed from the train, and borne along the fine old avenue of poplars and beech to the little Church of Laeken, where she had desired to rest.\* The King and his two sons

---

\* A new church has now been built in memory of the Queen.



sadly followed the bier. The day was one of universal mourning.

Two other occasions, when the public feeling of Belgium was strongly manifested, come back to our memory as we read M. Juste's work. The first was when, on the 22nd of August, 1853, the Duke of Brabant was married to the Austrian Archduchess, Maria Henrietta, and the whole country united in congratulating the heir to the throne and his fair young bride. The second was when, in July, 1856, a three days' festival was held at Brussels in honour of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Leopold's accession. On the 21st of that month, by a graceful and significant arrangement, he traversed the city by the same route he had followed just five and twenty years before, and on the same spot where he had sworn to observe the Constitution—an oath which, standing thus in the face of his people, all knew he had religiously kept—on that same spot he received an address of congratulation and respect from the surviving members of the Congress that had elected him. Thence he adjourned to a large open square in the suburb that bears his name. As we read M. Juste's pages it seems but as yesterday. The July sun was brilliant above us. The immense open space, thronged from end to end, grew "light with uncovered heads" as the Archbishop of Malines and his surpliced clergy intoned a solemn *Te Deum*. To us, standing on the outskirts of the throng, the tones of the full Gregorian came faint with distance, till they sounded more like a throb of music than a perceptible tune.

This was no mere empty festival, no indispensable exhibition of official joy. Neither was it with feelings of ordinary grief that Belgium mourned over the King's death on the 11th of December, 1865. During five and thirty years he had really been the father and guardian of his people. As we have already said, he was not a politician of striking or extraordinary genius. He did not, like Napoleon I., remodel a state, nor, like Napoleon III., change the course of its history. He was a man of cautious and clear intellect, rich in the garnered wisdom of a large experience. During the course of his life he had been thrown into familiar contact with such statesmen and diplomatists as Napoleon, Talleyrand, Metternich, Castlereagh, Stein, Canning, Peel, Palmerston, Thiers, Guizot, Napoleon III., and a host of others. From each he had learnt somewhat. And the treasure of his knowledge and sagacity had been freely placed at the disposal of the people who adopted him as their king. He guarded them

from outward harm, while he sedulously abstained from interfering with their liberties, or hindering their education in self-government. Rumours used to be current in Brussels about his private life. Such rumours ever cast a shadow—

“In that fierce light which beats against a throne,  
And blackens every blot.”

Into these we do not at all consider it our duty to enter. In his public life he was really great. It will ever be his glory to have given the world a pattern of what, in these later times, a Constitutional Monarch should be.

---

ART. III.—*Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., late Dean of St. Paul's. London: John Murray.

A YEAR ago we reviewed Dean Stanley's "Memorials of Westminster Abbey." At that time the venerable Dean of St. Paul's was writing the annals of his cathedral. This work is now before us. Its author did not live to complete the last chapter; but he had so nearly finished his task that this posthumous volume will deserve to stand by the side of his earlier works—no slight praise. The "Annals" are not so brilliant as the "Memorials," but are more methodical; they do not display the same fertility of ideas, but they are more strictly a record of facts. In breadth and catholicity of sympathies the two works are equal.

We said on the previous occasion that Westminster Abbey was "petrified history." The epithet is not so applicable to St. Paul's; yet it is not wholly inappropriate. If the cathedral has not, like the abbey, been the growth of centuries, the site and adjacent ground has seen and testified to the growth of the nation. True, the cathedral has few of the august associations which crowd around the abbey; true, that while the abbey has witnessed the coronation of all our sovereigns save one, the cathedral has not witnessed even that one; true, that while most of our kings, from the last of the Saxons to the second of the Brunswicks, were buried in the first building, only one royal head has rested in the second, and he, "old John of Gaunt, time-honoured Lancaster," never wore crown; true, most of our statesmen from John of Waltham to Palmerston, most of our poets, most of our warriors, most of our philosophers and men of science, repose in the abbey, not in the cathedral; yet while the abbey has seen more of the solemn and of the gorgeous pageants of history, the cathedral has seen more of the every-day life of the nation, with all its stir and deep emotion. St. Paul's has been, shame to say, the exchange of London's merchants, the resort of its profligate men and women, the haunt of the gossip by day, and of the thief plotting robbery for the night. But it has also been the court in which contending factions of Church and State have pleaded their cause before the people of England. At a time when journalism was not, when meetings meant popular riots, St. Paul's was at once the pulpit, the press, and the platform of the nation. Here the

Reformers arraigned the Papacy; here the Marian divines arraigned the Reformation. Here the Papal Bull excommunicating Elizabeth was posted by some brave adherent of the old faith, who was hanged for his intrepidity. Here the first convocation of the Reformed Church of England was held; and it was against the walls of this cathedral that the reek of the last martyrdom for religion was borne from adjacent Smithfield. If history consisted only of the coronations of kings and the funerals of conquerors, the cathedral church of St. Paul would bear no comparison with the abbey church of St. Peter. But it is the thoughts, and words, and deeds of the people which constitute the true life of the nation, and in these the cathedral will hold its own against the abbey. Nor is the fancy strained which would make the one structure symbolical of the constitution of England, and the other of the character of Englishmen. The abbey, standing opposite the two houses of the legislature, flanked by the departments of Government, and itself the work of centuries, fitly represents the slow and gradual growth of our institutions in Church and State. The cathedral, standing in the heart of the wealthiest and most populous city in the world, and, though so vast a work, built in a little over twenty years; conceived, begun, and completed by the same architect; with equal fitness represents the concentrated purpose, the unflagging energy, the vast schemes of the English merchant. The first embodies the traditions of ages; the second is the achievement of a single generation.

Whatever be our estimate of these two buildings, there can be no doubt as to the respective merits of the two sites. Thorn-Ey, on which the abbey was built, was a marshy waste at the time that the first monastery was founded. The summit of the modern Ludgate Hill must always have been a commanding situation. Standing on this spacious esplanade, the spectator in ancient times would have looked down upon the, as yet, unbridged Thames ebbing and flowing at his feet; and farther to the west the Fleet rivulet, then a pellucid stream, which, having welled forth from the dense forest-clad hills to the north of London, wound its course and became a navigable stream before falling into the Thames. It is just such a spot as would be chosen by the heathen Britons for a temple. As Dean Milman says:—

“If any faith is to be placed in Druidism, as described by the Roman writers, and embellished by later poetry, we might lead forth the white-robed priests in their long procession, with their attendant

bards, their glittering harps and sounding hymns, from the oak-clad heights to the north of London, to offer their sacrifices—bloody human sacrifices—or more innocent oblations of the fruits of the earth, on that hill-top from which anthems have so long risen to the Redeemer of mankind.”—P. 1.

Dean Milman, however, does not believe in a British London, in Geoffrey of Monmouth's great Trinobantine city. London cannot justly aspire to an earlier date than the reign of Claudius. There is strong evidence that the eminence on which the cathedral stands was a Roman prætorian camp, defending the growing and thriving city below. So soon as Christianity was introduced into England, and churches were built, there would be sure to be a church in London; for Dean Milman rejects the story of the apostleship of Joseph of Arimathea, puts no faith in the story of the mission of St. Paul. There is a strong probability that such a church would be built close to the camp. Before the church there was a temple to Diana. This was an old tradition, rejected as a legend by Wren, but curiously confirmed by recent discoveries. In the year 1830, during the excavations for the foundations of Goldsmiths' Hall, at a short distance from St. Paul's, was found a stone altar, with an image of Diana. The image was of rude provincial workmanship, yet in form and attitude closely resembled the Diana of the Louvre. When it is remembered that close by was the gate which led to the dense forests and hunting grounds on the north of London, it cannot be surprising that the Roman soldiers erected an altar to the goddess of the chase. Here the hunter would make his votive offerings, and this fact seems to confirm the tradition that large quantities of bones were dug up on this spot during the reign of Edward III. The probability, therefore, is great that a heathen preceded the Christian temple. Dean Stanley must confess that the evidence in favour of the Pauline's Temple of Diana is far stronger than that which supports the Westmonastrian's Temple of Apollo.

The Saxon invasion swept away every vestige of Roman civilisation and Roman Christianity in the southern and eastern parts of the island. Of this Christianity the reminiscences are obscure and doubtful. Dean Radulph de Diceto (temp. Richard I.) asserts that there were in pre-Saxon times three archbishoprics, and that the third was seated in London. Though Christianity died away after the departure of the Romans until the landing of Augustine, London by no means diminished. It was an important Saxon stronghold, and perchance a rude Saxon temple may have frowned down

from the heights above the Thames, where the Roman or Christian fanes had stood. It is historically certain that immediately after the re-conversion of Britain, Mellitus, the companion of Augustine, was consecrated Bishop of London by Augustine alone, and that Pope Gregory the Great condoned the irregularity because there was no other bishop in the island. The see assigned to Mellitus comprised the kingdom of the East Saxons, Middlesex, Essex, and Herts. But there came a gloomy time for Mellitus. The king who had befriended him died; his three sons adhered to heathenism: the Londoners, too, became heathen, and refused to receive their bishop. Mellitus went to Rome to consult the Pope; he returned as Archbishop of Canterbury; setting an example of translation which has just been repeated. For thirty-eight years after this there was no Bishop of London. The fourth successor of Mellitus was the famous St. Erkenwald. The history of his life, death, and burial abounds with miracles. There was a dispute about his sepulture; but the Londoners prevailed, and buried their pastor in the cathedral. The shrine was a source of great wealth, though its fame did not survive so long as that of the Confessor at Westminster, or that of à Becket, at Canterbury. After St. Erkenwald, darkness falls on the see and the cathedral of London. There is a long list of names, whose obscurity is relieved only in one instance, that of Dunstan, who held the see *in commendam* with the primacy. But if the Saxon bishops and deans were mere shadows of names, not so were the Saxon kings and nobles. They left substantial proofs of their existence in the estates which they bequeathed to the Chapter of St. Paul's. The Norman kings were liberal, too; and the form which their liberality assumed showed the altered times. The grant of the Conqueror to the Bishop of London was not an estate to be cultivated by peaceful tenants, husbandmen, shepherds, or foresters; it was a strong castle, that of (Bishop's) Stortford, in Essex, with its military retainers, who did service to the prelate, and swore homage and fealty to him. Feudalism had invaded the Church as well as the State, and the bishops became baronial nobles. The Bishop of London whom the Conqueror appointed was better than a warlike baron; he was a peace-maker. Perhaps he had learnt this blessed duty as chaplain to the peace-loving Edward. At any rate, he looked upon the people among whom he had lived with very different eyes from those with which the king who had vanquished beheld them. Through the bishop's intercession, the king restored and confirmed the ancient privileges of the citi-



zens of London, imperilled, perhaps forfeited, in the great and fearful conflict of races. The Londoners were not unmindful of the services he rendered. If superstitious devotees knelt at the shrine of the thaumaturgic Erkenwald, with more reason practical citizens made their annual pilgrimage, century after century, to the tomb of good Bishop William the Norman. It continued to the reign of Elizabeth. In that age of searching and questioning, even the pilgrimage came to be thought superstitious, and it gave way to a sermon, a change of doubtful advantage. But even in the next reign the benefactor of London was remembered by the citizens of London; and Lord Mayor Edward Barkham, 1662, restored the bishop's tomb, and inscribed some quaint verses upon it.

Bishop William lived just long enough to take part in a very important event of English Church history. In 1075, the year of his death, Primate Lanfranc held a great council in St. Paul's Cathedral. It was the first full ecclesiastical parliament of England; and he who presided over it was worthy of the post, for he was the most famous theologian of that day. The council was attended by almost all the bishops and greater abbots of the realm, with the heads of the religious orders. Both the archbishops were present, and of the bishops present there were, beside Bishop William, of London, the Bishops of Coutances (in Normandy), Winchester, Sherburne, Worcester, Hereford, Wells, Lincoln, Elmham (Norwich), Selsey (Chichester), Exeter, and Lichfield. Rochester was vacant, Lindisfarn and Durham on some excuse was absent. Of the Welsh bishops and of Ely no account is given. The question of precedence having been settled, some constitutions for the government of the regular clergy were passed, and were framed upon the stern rule of Bec. Monks were required to give up all their private property at death. Permission was granted to remove the see of Selsey to Chichester, of Sherburne to Salisbury, of Lichfield to Chester. For these translations the assent of the Crown was deemed requisite. The laws respecting marriage and simony were rendered more strict. Divinations and "other works of the Devil" were forbidden under penalty of excommunication. No bishop, abbot, or clerk was to sit in judgment or to give his sanction to any sentence of death or mutilation. Such were among the decrees of what may be called the first convocation of England. The building in which it sat was doomed to speedy destruction. Twelve years later (1087), a fire, almost as disastrous as that of 1666, devastated London, and either entirely consumed, or so damaged, the cathedral as

to render it unfit for public worship. Of this church no record survives by which we may judge of its architecture. Between the death of Bishop William and the fire, there had lived and died a Bishop of London remarkable for being a leper. Great as was the horror felt for this loathsome disease, it was not deemed a disqualification for the highest order in the Church. Bishop Maurice, in whose episcopate the cathedral was burnt, set about the work of rebuilding with, to use Dean Milman's words, "Norman boldness and true prelatie magnificence of design." William of Malmesbury speaks of the vast proportions of the new church, especially of the crypt, in which were deposited the precious remains of St. Erkenwald. Maurice ruled the diocese for twenty years; yet saw hardly more than the foundations of this vast edifice. His successor, Richard de Belmeis, who also ruled for twenty years, devoted the whole of his episcopal revenues to the holy work. His successor, Gilbert, was a very different sort of man. He was called "The Universal," on account of his vast learning. He was also a man of vast wealth, for he exacted much, gave little. On his death, enormous wealth was found in his treasury. The Crown seized it. His boots, full of gold and silver, were carried to the exchequer. A little later another terrible fire devastated London. It burned from London Bridge to St. Clement's Danes; and, according to Paris, the cathedral was wholly destroyed. Dean Milman believes this to be an exaggeration. Collections were made—not only in London, but throughout the diocese of Winchester—in behalf of the restoration; and the Bishop urged, as a reason for giving, that although St. Paul had planted so many churches, and illuminated the whole world, this was the only church specially dedicated to the great Apostle. The cathedral was so far restored in the latter half of the twelfth century, that it was available for worship, and witnessed a very remarkable event. Between Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Foliot, Bishop of London, there was a feud. The Bishop sided with the King. The Archbishop excommunicated the Bishop in his own cathedral. An emissary of Becket had the boldness to enter the building during a solemn service, and thrusting the roll of excommunication into the hands of the officiating priest, proclaimed, with a loud voice, "Know all men that Gilbert, Bishop of London, is excommunicated by Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury." The messenger escaped with some difficulty from the ill-usage of the people. Foliot maintained his dignity, and protested against a sentence passed without a trial in

defiance of a well-known canon of Pope Sixtus. He appealed to Rome. The appeal was long in suspense. The Pontiff favoured Becket, but Foliot being the treasurer through whose hands passed the Papal income derived from England, and hinting more than once at his willingness to recognise the anti-Pope, Becket could not obtain such a decisive condemnation as he wished. At length he issued an interdict warning the archdeacon and the clergy of St. Paul's to abstain from all communion with their diocesan. Foliot defied the order for a time, but at last bowed before the authority of the Primate, and did not enter the cathedral. Not the less did he urge forward the completion of the building. He died in 1187, leaving two volumes of letters. He was the first literary bishop, and his contemporary, Radolph de Diceto, was the first literary Dean of St. Paul's. It was Radolph who built the deanery to be inhabited hereafter by many men of letters—by Colet, Nowell, Donne, Sancroft, Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Sherlock, Butler, Secker, Newton, Van Mildert, Coplestone, Milman, and now by Mansel.

“During the reign of Richard I., there were terrible tumults in the City of London. It was a strife between the rich and the poor. The poor complained of the unjust and unequal distribution of certain burdens. . . . William Fitz Osbert was the demagogue of the day, Paul's Cross was the rostrum from whence he poured forth his inflammatory harangues. He is said to have risen up against the dignity of the Crown, and to have administered unlawful oaths to his followers. The cathedral was invaded by the rioters, the sacred services frequently disturbed by seditious cries, clamours, and tumults. Fitz Osbert seized the tower of a church belonging to the archbishop, probably St. Mary-le-Bow (still a peculiar of Canterbury), and stood out an obdurate siege. Being heavily pressed, he set fire to the church, dedicated to the Virgin. The holy building was burned to the ground, an awful warning to the neighbouring cathedral. Fitz Osbert was dragged out of the ruins, conveyed to the Tower, and, as a terror to the rest, drawn naked through the city, and burned alive in chains with some of his followers. The poor were obliged to give hostages for their peaceable conduct, and the city and cathedral were at rest. Paul's Cross was silent for many years.”—*Annals*, pp. 38, 39.

It was destined to become the most famous platform of rival religionists and politicians.

A few years later not only Paul's Cross, but the cathedral itself was silent. Bishop William Santa de Maria obeyed the Papal mandate, and read the fearful interdict which placed a whole kingdom under the ban, because of the offences of the king. The terrible sentence was read in

St. Paul's by its bishop, and thenceforth the bells were silent, and the gates closed. Infants lay unbaptized, except with some hasty and imperfect ceremony. Joyless marriages were hurriedly performed in the church porch; the dying yearned in vain for anointment with the blessed oil, and for the Holy Eucharist; the dead were buried in unconsecrated ground. Yet the bishop, who had not hesitated to put his whole diocese thus under the ban, shrank from extending it to one man, the bad King John. The bishop went to the Continent for five years, during which the King visited his wrath on the bishops and the clergy. When, at the expiration of that time, John made his submission, there was a short-lived peace, celebrated by a banquet, at which king and bishops were present. Three weeks later there was a great gathering of prelates, abbots, deans, priors, and barons of England in St. Paul's. "After some slight business, Langton led aside some of the more distinguished barons and prelates, displayed the old charter of Henry I., and solemnly enjoined them to stand firm for the liberties of England, and pledged himself with equal solemnity to their support. That convention at St. Paul's was the prelude to that more memorable scene at Runnymede." It was a noble piece, of which the metropolitan cathedral was the stage. Very shortly afterwards it was to witness a drama equally disgraceful. The King and the Pope made friends, and the King did homage for his kingdom to the Pope in the person of the Cardinal Legate, who received John's submission before the high altar of St. Paul's. What wonder if bishops and barons, churchmen and laymen, welcomed a "foreign prince" of their own choice, rather than the arrogant pontiff who claimed to rule the world. Excommunicated bishops and priests chanted a magnificent mass in honour of Louis of France at St. Paul's, and to their cathedral crowded the citizens of London, in order to do homage to the sovereign who had promised to rescue them from the degradation into which their own pusillanimous king had brought them.

England was now in danger of sinking into an appanage of France. Happily at this juncture John died, and the barons having no longer a treacherous man to deal with, but a boy, rallied around their legitimate sovereign, at the same time taking steps to secure their independence. The Pope also supported the young Henry, and in so doing obtained a position which he would not otherwise have secured. The weak king was completely under the influence of the Legate Otho, who obtained the richest benefices in the kingdom for Italian

priests, and openly lording it over God's heritage, by taking his seat on a lofty platform at St. Paul's, with the bishops and abbots of the church at his feet. He had summoned them to hear the new laws which he had just brought from Rome. He was met at the porch of the cathedral by a long procession with tapers, music, and litany. He advanced and arrayed himself before the high altar in his splendid vestments, ascended the lofty platform, and preached the first sermon of which we have any report in St. Paul's. The text was Ezekiel i. 5, "In the midst of the throne and round about it were four beasts." The beasts were the prelates of the church, whose vigilant eyes ought to be everywhere. They had ears as well as eyes on this occasion. A wild tempest was raging without, fulfilling the prognostication of an enthusiastic soothsayer. There was to be a tempest within. Silently the prelates listened to the twelve first constitutions announced by the Legate; but when he came to the thirteenth, which required a dispensation from the Pope to hold pluralities, probably the best regulation of all, there was an ominous murmur. Then up rose Walter de Cantelupe, Bishop of Worcester, afterwards one of Simon de Montfort's noblest colleagues, and, taking off his mitre, made his solemn protest in the name of the clergy of England. He declared that they would not be plundered in that way; he advised the Pope to reconsider his edict, and sat down amid great applause. The cardinal, whom the obsequiousness of Roger, Bishop of London, had made insolent, was overawed by this boldness on the part of Roger's brother prelate, and consented to withdraw the obnoxious canon. Roger was not always obsequious. Twice he excommunicated the money-lenders and usurers, although they were Italians and favoured by the Pope. On one occasion the populace burned the premises of these persons. This act cost Roger a journey to Rome and a heavy fine. He was a munificent contributor to the endowment and the completion of the cathedral. He also obtained for the clergy of London a certain assessment in the pound from the citizens, and the amount continued to be paid until the great fire. A few years after Roger's death, the cathedral bell became the tocsin which called the citizens together. They assembled in a folk's-mote at Paul's Cross. On one occasion a roll was read containing charges of oppression against the rulers of the city. On another occasion, 1259, Henry III. was present with his brother Richard and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and caused the oath of allegiance to himself and his heirs to be administered, even to striplings of twelve years old. In spite of this oath, the people, with the Bishop, Henry

de Sandwith, at their head, sided with De Montfort and the barons against the king. The people arrested the queen as she endeavoured to pass up the Thames from the Tower to Windsor. The bishop interposed, and gave her respectful treatment, and a place of safety at the episcopal residence. A little later he was excommunicated for having been concerned in the arrest of the Papal legate on his way to England. The said legate immediately afterwards becoming Pope Clement IV., Sandwith had to journey to Rome for absolution, lingered there six years before he could procure it, and returned to England only to die. About a hundred years later, a more tragical event took place in London. Simon de Sudbury, who had been Bishop of London, but was afterwards Primate and Lord Chancellor of England, was seized by an insurgent rabble, and put to death on Tower-hill. It was in his temporal, not in his spiritual, capacity that he had made himself odious to them. Nevertheless, the high church party of that time saw in his violent death a just punishment of his lenity towards the Wycliffites.

That last word brings us to a memorable scene. Wycliffe was summoned to answer at St. Paul's, before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, for opinions deserving ecclesiastical censure. He was accompanied by John of Gaunt and Lord Percy, the Earl Marshal. Wycliffe could not make his way through the dense throng which beset the cathedral. Lord Percy used the authority of his office to clear a path. The Bishop, William de Courtenay, of the noble house of Devonshire, and a haughty man, resented the appearance of the nobles. Angry words had already passed, when Percy demanded a seat for Wycliffe, saying "he had many things to answer, and needed a soft seat." "It is contrary to law and reason," said Courtenay, "that one cited before his Ordinary should be seated." Fierce language ensued, and John of Gaunt was reported to threaten that he would drag the bishop out of the church by the hair of his head. The insult to their bishop enraged the people. The privileges of the city were supposed to be menaced by the Earl Marshal's assumption of superiority within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor. "A wild tumult began. The proceedings were broken up. Wycliffe, who had all along stood silent, retired. Lancaster and the Earl Marshal had doubtless sufficient force to protect their persons. But, throughout the city, the populace arose; they attacked John of Gaunt's magnificent palace, the Savoy; his arms were reversed, like those of a traitor. The palace, but for the Bishop of London, must have been burnt down. A



luckless clergyman, mistaken for the Earl Marshal, was brutally murdered." This was, probably, the last time that John of Gaunt entered the cathedral alive. He was carried there a few years later, and, alone of the royal families of England, was buried in the cathedral. Dugdale contains an engraving of the richly canopied monument which was raised to his memory, and that of Constance, his wife, whose effigy lay by the side of his. Another royal corpse was brought to St. Paul's, that of the ill-fated Richard II. For three days the body of the murdered king lay exposed to public view before it was taken to Langley for burial. This exposure did not prevent the generally received rumour that Richard was not really dead, and that the body so ostentatiously exhibited was that of his chaplain, who bore a strong likeness to the king.

During the reign of Henry IV., Robert de Braybroke was Bishop of London. He was a vigorous reformer of practical abuses. He issued a strong rebuke against working on Sundays and feast-days; especially against shoe-makers and cobblers. A prohibition was read at Paul's Cross against barbers shaving on Sundays. "As usual," adds Dean Milman, "these mandates struck at humble sinners." He flew at higher game, however. He reformed the Chapter, which sorely needed reformation. The cathedral itself had fallen into disrepute. Bishop Braybroke issued letters denouncing the profanation of those who made the church a house of merchandise. To them he held up the rebuke of Christ to the money-changers in the Temple. He dealt with worse abuses. "Others," he said, "by the instigation of the devil, do not scruple, with stones and arrows, to bring down the birds, pigeons, and jackdaws which nestle in the walls and crevices of the building; others play at ball and other unseemly games both within and without the building, breaking the beautiful and costly painted windows, to the amazement of the spectators." The bishop threatened the offenders, if they did not desist, with the greater excommunication. Braybroke's successor, Arundel, afterwards primate, held almost annual convocations in St. Paul's. There was pronounced by him the first capital sentence under the writ *de Hæretico Comburendo*, which he had been mainly instrumental in passing. William Sautree, the first martyr of Wycliffism, vacillated and recanted, but at length was degraded from the priesthood and burnt. At the same convocation which condemned him, John Purvey, who had been recognised almost as the successor of Wycliffe, was induced to renounce his opinions. During the episcopate of

Robert Gilbert, 1436—1448, a redoubtable divine played a very heroic part. Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester, though the uncompromising opponent of Lollard doctrines, though the author of the greatest theological work which had till then appeared in England, contrived to incur the censure of his brother bishops for heresy. According to popular belief, he had denied that the Apostles' Creed was written by the Apostles; he had questioned the descent of Christ into hell. His abjuration states, that he had taught that it was not necessary to salvation to believe in the Holy Ghost as dwelling in the Church, the Pope, or the episcopate; nor that it was necessary to believe in the Universal Church; nor that the Church could not err in matters of faith. He appeared in his episcopal robes; knelt before the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Rochester, and consigned his voluminous works to the flames. As Dean Milman remarks:—

“Faith makes martyrs; fanaticism makes martyrs; logic makes none. Pecock had followed out his own thoughts to their legitimate conclusion, but with his temper of mind conclusions are not convictions. The poor tailor, the humble artisan, had confronted the stake and the fire, and laid down their lives for their faith. The great intellect of his age, the most powerful theologian in England, disgraced himself by miserable cowardice.”

Then came the wars of the Roses. The clergy of St. Paul's took no active part in the bitter struggle; but they saw the champions of both parties crowd to the cathedral to return thanks as each prevailed. “St. Paul's was summoned to witness, as it were, to ratify and hallow, all the changes of these terrible times. What solemn perjuries were uttered; what pompous but hollow thanksgivings resounded within its walls, as each faction triumphed, and appealed to God for the justice of its cause;—success, the sole test of its justice!” After the bloody battle of St. Alban's, 1458, there was a brief truce. An open reconciliation took place in St. Paul's. Great nobles, soon to meet again in deadly strife, walked together.

“Then came the poor king, crowned, with a sceptre in his hand. The queen followed smiling (oh! the bitterness of that smile), and conversing familiarly with the Duke of York. They knelt in prayer—one at least, the king, on his footstool in devout earnest Christian prayer. The nobles were on their knees behind. High mass was sung; the archbishop pronounced the benediction—‘go in peace,’—that benediction to have but brief, but very slight effect! The people, no doubt, rejoiced at heart and listened to the service with fond hopes of happier and more peaceful times.”—*Annals*, p. 102.

Three years passed, and again King Henry, the poor weak-minded monarch, is seen approaching in procession the west door of St. Paul's. It was but a sorry thanksgiving. The queen was a fugitive in the north, striving to rally the scattered Lancastrians; Blackheath and Northampton had been fought, and Henry had been compelled to disinherit his own son, and to award the succession to the Duke of York. The duke was present to enjoy the discomfiture of his sovereign and foe; yet it was only a paper crown, set in cruel mockery upon his lifeless head, that the duke was destined to wear. A third time St. Paul's receives a procession; it is that which accompanied the duke's son, who had won the regal crown at a second battle of St. Alban's, and came to the metropolitan cathedral as Edward IV. Ten years later the body of the deposed and, as many affirmed, murdered Henry VI., was brought to St. Paul's. Blood had gushed from the dead man's nose, sure token of foul play, dealt, as all the world believed, by Richard of Gloucester. That same Gloucester paid his orisons at St. Paul's just before he murdered his nephews in the Tower, for Richard was desirous to win the good opinion of the citizens. A few weeks later all London witnessed the penance of Jane Shore, as she walked to St. Paul's in her shameful dress, moving even hard hearts by her perfect loveliness. The civil wars were over, and the rival Roses united in marriage, yet peace was not wholly restored. There was an insurrection under Lambert Simnel. King Henry treated the traitor-cook with royal contempt. Going to St. Paul's in state to return thanks for the suppression of the rebellion, he made Simnel ride in his train, a spectacle for the scorn of the men he had sought to delude. The reign of Henry VIII. was famous in the annals of St. Paul's. Before considering the events of that stirring time, we shall do well to learn something more than has yet been told of the fabric and the revenues of the cathedral, and of the constitution of its chapter.

St. Paul's was, from the first, a secular foundation. The tradition that it was originally a monastery had no other foundation than the desire to rival the West Monastery in Thorney Island, Westminster Abbey. St. Paul's was, indeed, surrounded with monastic establishments, the Black Friars', the White Friars', the Grey Friars', the Templars' Monasteries, the Priors of St. John, Clerkenwell, St. Bartholomew, Smithfield, of the Carthusians, hard by, now the Charterhouse. But St. Paul's had no relation with any of these institutions. They scarcely acknowledged the jurisdiction of the bishop. He,

with the dean and his thirty canons, constituted the great chapter. Nominally, but scarcely more really than in our own times, the canons elected the bishop. In early times the bishop presided over the administration and the government of the cathedral. But as he became a great court official, he left those duties to the dean. He became almost an autocrat, and claimed so much power that the canons resisted him, and declared that as he did not hold a prebend (*præbendum*, a portion) he had no power at all. This technical objection was not allowed to stand in the way for any long time. In order that the deans might not be forced to remain outside the door of the Chapter House while the chapter were transacting business, they were always presented to a prebendal stall, and thus established the right to preside over the deliberations of the chapter. The theory of the chapter contemplated a life led in common, not conventual (there was no seclusion), but collegiate. A non-resident canon was, in early days, an abuse abhorrent to the clergy. It was the rule that all the canons should attend daily all the services of the church, with their minor canons and other officiating ministers. But abuses crept in. The thirty minor canons (now represented by six vicars) chanted the service, and soon the good old rule was established that there should be one to perform the duty, while the other secured the emoluments. The canons found the daily service irksome, and retirement to their prebendal estates a welcome change. The bishop had set the example by living at Fulham; why should not the thirty follow it by betaking themselves to the pleasant villages apportioned to them, lying on the banks of the Thames, or in the fair woodlands of Middlesex, Essex, and Herts? This absenteeism prevailed for a time, but for gold even the dull routine of collegiate life and daily prayer would seem endurable. The common fund from the demesne lands of the cathedral and from other sources increased enormously. As it fell almost exclusively to the share of the residentiaries, residence became the object of cupidity and competition. All the thirty were now as eager to avail themselves of their once despised rights as they were before to elude the burdensome duties. It became as necessary for episcopal and Papal authority to limit the number of residents, as it had before been for such authority to compel residence. Thus grew up a chapter within a chapter. The canons and the prebendaries, at first one, became distinct. The second lived on the prebendal estates apart from the cathedral, in which, however, they had stalls; the first resided and administered the affairs of the cathedral.

The minor canons were a college of twelve priests, founded in the time of Richard II., and endowed with their own estates. At an election they presented two candidates to the chapter, who selected one. The prebendal estates already mentioned, were by no means the sole source of wealth. One most fertile source was the anniversaries, days appointed to commemorate the deaths of eminent persons who had bequeathed money for that purpose. These included many foreign princes, among them no less illustrious potentates than Charles V., Emperor of Germany, and Francis I., King of France. There were 111 of these anniversaries. A still more lucrative revenue was derived from chantries in which masses were to be sung for the departed until the day of doom. St. Paul's was richer in these than any other cathedral in England. The list fills nearly forty folio pages in Dugdale. They were founded by kings, bishops, deans, canons, nobles, judges, and wealthy citizens. They varied in value from lands and manors to lamps and candles, and pittances of bread and wine. Henry IV. founded the most richly endowed charity. It provided for full services on two days of the year in behalf of his father and mother. It assigned stipends to the dean, the canons, and the officials, down even to the bell-ringers, and also to the mayor and the sheriffs of London for their attendance. A house was rented by the Bishop of London, in which the chantry priests were to reside. There was a large assortment of chalices, missals, and other articles, and it was ordered that eighty tapers should burn on the anniversaries of the deaths of Henry's parents and on other great festivals. Some of these chantries or chapels were beautiful to behold, not so they who performed in them. The "mass-priests" bore an evil reputation from the time of Chaucer downwards. Archbishop Sudbury has described them in terms which Dean Milman has softened out of regard to modern fastidiousness. It was not surprising that they turned out so ill. After mass they had the whole day before them, and being illiterate and rude, betook themselves to taverns, and even more questionable houses. But the pride and glory of St. Paul's and the richest fountain of its wealth was the shrine of St. Erkenwald already mentioned. The body of the saint had formerly reposed in the crypt. It was translated with great pomp in the reign of Stephen, and placed behind the high altar. A magnificent shrine was contributed, and three goldsmiths, of London, were employed for a whole year on the work. St. Erkenwald was, in fact, a second patron saint of the cathedral, as the Confessor was of Westminster Abbey. Both, according to the popular belief,

wrought while dead far more miracles than had been performed by the great Apostle of the Gentiles while living. It is impossible to ascertain the amount of the offerings to St. Erkenwald. There were two alms-boxes, and we know that one of them during the month of May, 1344, yielded £50, which would give an average of £600 per annum, or, at the present value of money, £9,000. A portion of these revenues was probably devoted to the maintenance of the fabric; another portion to the relief of the poor; but it is more than probable that a large sum found its way into the pockets of the canons. The dean and chapter were indeed rigid on the maintenance of their rights. The bell-ringers had formed an evil habit of appropriating to themselves the countless wax-lights and tapers after they had burned long enough on the shrines and tombs. The dean and the canons discovered this practice, prohibited it, and ordered the extinguished lights to be carried to a room under the chapter-house, and there melted for the benefit of the dean and residentiaries.

Paul's Cross, as famous as Paul's Church, stood at the north-east corner of the cathedral. Originally it was probably like other crosses erected at the entrance of the churchyard, to remind the passers-by to pray for the dead. At an early period a pulpit was erected there. This and the cross were supplanted by a more splendid stone cross and pulpit, which, from its grace, became the pride of London.

"Paul's Cross was the pulpit not only of the cathedral—it might almost be said, as preaching became more popular, and began more and more to rule the public mind, to have become that of the Church of England. The most distinguished ecclesiastics, especially from the universities, were summoned to preach before the Court—for the Court sometimes attended—and the city of London. Nobles vied with each other in giving hospitality to those strangers. The mayor and aldermen (this was at a later period) were required to provide 'sweet and convenient lodgings for them, with fire, candles, and all other necessaries.' Excepting the King and his retinue, who had a covered gallery, the congregation—even the mayor and aldermen—stood in the open air. When the weather was very wet, the sermon was delivered in a place called the 'shrouds.' (This Dean Milman supposes to have been the underground church of St. Faith, which is called in some records St. Faith in the Shrouds.) . . . Paul's Cross was not only the great scene for the display of eloquence by distinguished preachers. It was that of many public acts—some relating to ecclesiastical affairs, some of mixed cast, some simply political. Here Papal bulls were promulgated; here excommunications were thundered out; here sinners of high position did penance; here heretics knelt and read their recantations, or, if obstinate, were



marched off to Smithfield. Paul's Cross was never darkened by the smoke of human sacrifices. Here miserable men and women suspected of witchcraft confessed their wicked dealings; here, as we shall see hereafter, great impostures were exposed, and strange frauds unveiled in the face of day. Here, too, occasionally, royal edicts were published; here addresses were made on matters of state to the thronging multitudes, supposed to represent the metropolis; here kings were proclaimed, probably traitors denounced."—*Annals*, pp. 163, 164.

The sixteenth century opened with great events at St. Paul's. It was in November, 1501, that the marriage took place between Prince Arthur, eldest son of Henry VII., and Catherine of Arragon. It was celebrated with the utmost pomp at the cathedral, and at the west door the conduits ran with wine. Six weeks had not passed when the bridegroom was in his grave, and money-reverencing Henry was planning the marriage of his second son to the highly dowered widow. Henry died about seven years later, having accomplished his wish, and his body lay in state in the cathedral. There were splendid ceremonials during the first year of the eighth Henry's reign. Cardinal Wolsey took part in some of them. In 1521 the Pope's sentence against Martin Luther was read in the cathedral. Wolsey attended, and was conducted to the high altar under a canopy, supported by four doctors. A year later Charles V. visited England, and attended high mass at St. Paul's. Of course the Cardinal was present on such an occasion as this, and he was censured by more than twenty prelates at once. In spite of Cardinal and Emperor, in spite of sermon against Martinus Eleutherus and his works, and the burning of these, because their author was not at hand, in spite of sermons from Paul's Cross against the new doctrines, these were fast gaining ground. Previously to the ceremonials just described, there had lived and died one of the most remarkable men ever connected with the cathedral. This was Dean Colet, the friend of Erasmus, one of the reformers before the Reformation. The two men had formed a friendship at Oxford, which lasted throughout their lives. Colet had not the wit of Erasmus, but he had far more courage. The Englishman frightened the great Dutchman by the openness of his sarcastic comments upon the Canterbury pilgrims as they journeyed to the shrine of St. Thomas. It was Colet who, at Paul's Cross, first opened the Scriptures freely to the people. It was he who in one of his sermons ventured to declare that the lives of wicked priests were a worse heresy than Lollardism. It was Colet who, being summoned to preach in the cathedral on a great occasion, when

all the bishops and the dignitaries of the Church were present, denounced those who had obtained preferment by unworthy means, who had led luxurious lives, spent their vast incomes on themselves, kept their hearts so as to feel no compunction. "How many hated themselves, how many hated the preacher," says Dean Milman. Sir Thomas More loved him, and considered the day lost in which he had not heard Colet. King Henry VIII. respected him. Wolsey was urging Henry to war. Colet, from his pulpit, preached a powerful sermon against war. The matter was reported to the King, who sent for the preacher; but after talking with him, thanked him. The King became more passionately warlike than ever; the preacher became more boldly denunciatory of war. Again Henry showed a magnanimity that one would hardly expect from a man who assumed almost Papal infallibility. He had a long interview with Colet in order to ease his conscience, and at the end of it said, aloud, "Let everyone have his doctor; this is the doctor for me." The good dean has a lasting memorial of his beneficence in Paul's School, which he endowed to the value of nearly £40,000 of our money. There was a curious mixture of rationalism—in the good sense of the word—and mysticism in Colet. He who first ventured to assert that the days spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis were not ordinary astronomical days, but a figure of speech, he who ventured to translate the Lord's Prayer into the vulgar tongue, for the benefit of his scholars, ordered that the number of these scholars should be 153, because that was the number of fishes taken in the miraculous draught. Soon after passing his fiftieth year, he meditated retirement from his active labours. He was the sole survivor of twenty-two children, and his health was feeble. He was about to enter the house of the Carthusians at Sheen, when he was carried off by the sweating sickness, and a great light of the English Church was extinguished. His successor Pace was an able man, with a different kind of ability. Pace was a courtier, a diplomatist, and suspected as a rival of the great Wolsey. He was not the man to advance the Reformation. He could not retard it.

We come now to the most eventful period of the *Annals of St. Paul's*. The Cathedral and the Cross were many times the field of battle between the old faith and the new. The issue of the conflict was long in doubt. Mr. Froude has described the memorable scene of Shrove Tuesday, 1527, when Barnes and five "Stillyard men" did penance before the great cardinal, eighteen bishops, and a number of mitred

abbots, for the heinous sin of circulating the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. The magnates sat upon a lofty platform in the centre of the nave. Opposite it was the famous crucifix, "Rood of Northern," before which a fire was burning, and around which were arranged in baskets the tracts and Testaments ready for the sacrifice. There was a lower platform opposite the first, and there on their knees with fagots on their shoulders the six transgressors asked pardon of God and Holy Church for their high crimes and offences. The confession over, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, preached a sermon. One would like to know the passage of Scripture upon which he based the argument that Scripture ought not to be read. After the sermon came the sacrifice. The books were committed to the flames. Barnes rejoiced that he was not in their place, said effusively that he was more charitably handled than he deserved. He was absolved. Hereafter he was to encounter bravely the fate which he then shunned. He again upheld Reformed opinions; again recanted them, and then recanted his recantation. For this he and two brethren were committed to the flames at Smithfield. They, "anti-Papalists," were not the only martyrs on that occasion. Three "Papalists" suffered at the same time for denying the king's supremacy. On this matter the one-sided untrustworthy Foxe is extremely reticent. The martyrologist was the worthy prototype of the religious party paper. The king's marriage was the text for numberless sermons at the two pulpits (the Cathedral and the Cross) during the seven years that it was agitated. There seems to have been unusual freedom allowed to the preachers to speak their minds, even though they opposed the royal wishes. From Paul's Cross was read the Act whereby the Pope's supremacy was finally abrogated; and orders were given for the preaching of sermons to support and enforce the Act. This was in 1534. In 1536 Ann Boleyn was executed; and the hopes of the Reformers, so strong two years before, were sorely dimmed. The Reformation seemed to have received its death-blow. But courage revived when Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, ascended the cathedral pulpit, and, in the presence of a vast concourse of bishops, clergy, and laity, preached one of the sermons afterwards to become so famous. The Bishop, Stokesley, tried to moderate Latimer's fervour, and did his utmost to confer on him the crown of martyrdom; but he was not to wear it, until after Stokesley's death. That event took place about ten months after another and irrecoverable blow had been struck at the old faith. It was a

harder blow even than the homely forcible logic of Lati-mer:—

"On Sunday, November 24th, 1538, the rood of Boxley in Kent, made to move the eyes and lips, to bow, to seem to speak; which had been working there unquestioned miracles for centuries; having been detected by a clever rationalist of the day, and exposed with all its springs and ingenious machinery, at Maidstone, at Whitehall; was brought to St. Paul's to meet its final discomfiture and doom. To the curious and intelligent citizens of London the whole trickery was shown. Ridley, now Bishop of Rochester, preached a sermon. The holy wonder-working image was thrown down and broken to pieces amid the jeers and scoffs of the rabble."—*Annals*, p. 202.

Stokesley's successor was Bonner. He and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, attained a bad eminence for the cruel rigour with which they used that "whip with six strings," the six articles.\* One of the first victims was Barnes, whom we have already seen in St. Paul's burning his tracts and Testaments before the great rood. Later, the people had become so bewildered by the changes of faith decreed by the capricious king, and so violent a reaction in favour of the old religion had set in, that it was thought necessary to preach to them short homilies to explain the principal and uncontested Christian doctrines. Archbishop Cranmer preached at St. Paul's on the reading of Holy Scripture. Bonner preached on charity, a virtue not usually associated with his name. Though the wonder-working roods had been trodden under foot, though the monasteries had been destroyed, there was still left a good deal of the old ritual. Towards the close of Henry's reign there was a great procession from St. Paul's to St. Peter's in Cornhill, with all the children of St. Paul's School and a cross of every parish church, and "parsons and vicars of every church in new copes, and the choir of St. Paul's in the same manner; and the bishop (Bonner) bearing the sacrament under a canopy met the Mayor in a gown of crimson velvet, the aldermen, and all the crafts in their best apparel, and at the Cross was proclaimed, with heralds and pursuivants, universal peace for ever between the Emperor, the King of England, the King of France, and all Christian kings for ever."

With the accession of Edward VI. (January 28, 1547) the Reformation received a fresh impulse. A certain Dr. Glazier

\* The Six Articles were:—1st. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation established by the law. 2nd. The Communion, in both kinds, excluded. 3rd. The Marriage of Priests forbidden. 4th. Vows of Celibacy declared obligatory. 5th. Private Masses for Souls in Purgatory upheld; and 6th. Auricular Confession pronounced expedient and necessary to be retained.

preached at St. Paul's against the observance of Lent by fasting. Ridley inveighed against the worship of pictures, the adoration of saints, and the use of holy water. Yet these new doctrines were being taught, the old ceremonies, which, appealing to the senses, are always longer lived than doctrines which appeal to the intellect, were retained. A requiem mass was sung by Cranmer and eight mitred bishops for Francis I. of France, and the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen were among those who crowded the sable-hung cathedral. That same year in September was executed the edict of the Council which commanded the destruction of images in churches. The iconoclasts did their work at St. Paul's by night; perhaps, as Dean Milman suggests, because they feared the indignation of the people. The chronicler of that time viewed the work with little favour, and carefully noted that two of the men engaged in it were killed. With the images fell the boxes for oblations. A heavier loss befel the cathedral. By one remorseless and sweeping act all obits and chantries were swept away, and their endowments and estates poured into the insatiate gulf of the royal treasury. The money, if it had done no good to the dead, for whose benefit it had been bequeathed, as little advantaged the living. It was seized by the rapacious and unprincipled members of the Council, whose zeal for the Reformation was warm in proportion as the confiscation of the old revenues was large. Mr. Froude has told how the halls of country houses were hung with altar cloths, how tables and beds were quilted with copes, how the knights and the squires drank their claret out of chalices, and watered their horses in marble coffins. So it ever is. The devout offerings of one age become identified with the superstitions of the next; and, while the sincere reformer attacks the second, the covetous spoiler, who always follows in his track and apes his zeal, appropriates the first. So too, when true doctrine has been overlaid with false, the reformer is followed by the unbeliever, and while the first would restore, the second denies and scoffs at the truth. Thus it was with the Eucharist in the days of Edward VI. Ridley and the other reformers endeavoured to raise it from the gross materialism in which it had been involved by the advocates of transubstantiation. But these advocates had brought the sacrament into ridicule, and Ridley and his colleagues preached in vain. Boys wrangled in the cathedral about the holy mysteries, scoffers derided what they termed the "Jack-in-the-box." The word *hocus-pocus*, by which we designate the trickery of *leger-de-main*, was derived from

the solemn words *hoc est corpus*, with which the first Eucharist was celebrated. The superstition which degrades had given rise to the scepticism which degrades. The stately bell tower of St. Paul's and its famous Jesus bells were set on a throw of the dice against a stake of £100. The Protector Somerset, who had contemplated demolishing Westminster Abbey, and using its stones to build his palace on the Thames, did pull down a portion of St. Paul's, the chapel and the charnel house in the "Pardon churchyard," and carted the bones of the dead to Finsbury. The dean and chapter had to petition that a certain number of articles might be spared to them (out of the enormous treasures confiscated by the spoiler) in order that they might celebrate the sacrament with decency. Ridley tried, not wholly in vain, to rescue some of the endowments from the rapacious robber for the benefit of the poor. Alas! Ridley too took part in the judgment by which a crazy woman was condemned to the stake for holding wild notions about our Lord's Incarnation. At Easter, 1548, the Communion was administered according to the Anglican form. After Easter, the English service was performed regularly, by order of the dean, Bonner remaining in seclusion at Fulham. In the following year, Bonner's withdrawal from public notice could not save him from disgrace. On August 17, he officiated according to the new rite "discreetly and sadly." Thenceforward he was ordered to reside in his town palace, to officiate in the cathedral on all great festivals, and to proceed against those persons who went to mass. He was, moreover, ordered to preach sermons on subjects chosen with evident malice, so as to entangle him. On September 1st, he ascended the pulpit at Paul's Cross, and preached to the vast assemblage at his feet. He touched on most of the points contained in the instructions, but eluded that one which was held to be the test of Popish and disloyal sentiments—obedience to the king though a minor. He asserted transubstantiation in the strongest terms. This sermon answered the purpose of those who had devised it. Bonner was committed to the Tower, where he remained until the death of the King, and the See of London was declared vacant. Bonner was succeeded by Ridley, who maintained friendly relations with his predecessor, and made the mother and the sister of the deposed prelate continue to reside at Fulham. On St. Barnabas' Day, 1540, the altar in the cathedral was pulled down and a table set up in its place, with a curtain drawn to exclude non-communicants. This last fact has some interest for English churchmen to-day, with whom the presence of non-communicants during celebration



is a moot point. As usual, the work of reformation was marred by acts of iconoclastic fanaticism. Not only were days, hitherto kept holy, no longer religiously observed, but they were avowedly and ostentatiously profaned. The goodly stone work behind the altar was "remorselessly cut and hacked away," and the splendid monument of John of Gaunt was with difficulty spared. The organ was silenced. On All-hallows Day, the new liturgy, almost identical with that now used, was first heard in St. Paul's, and from that time, with a brief interval, the Church ceased to speak in a language "not understood of the people." On that day Ridley read the prayers, and preached without vestments. His sermon was so long, that the Mayor and the Aldermen, weary of standing before Paul's Cross, stole away. In less than three years later Ridley preached another sermon, which disgusted his hearers and sealed his fate. Edward was dead. Lady Jane Grey had been proclaimed queen by her supporters. The Bishop of London threw himself desperately into the anti-Marian faction. From Paul's Cross he denounced both Mary and Elizabeth as bastards. Finding that he had misjudged the temper of the nation, he stole away to Cambridge to make peace with the sovereign he had reviled. Fortunately for his fame, Mary and her ministers did not, as they might well have done, punish him as a traitor, but gave him an opportunity of dying for the faith as a martyr, which he gloriously used. St. Paul's repudiated its bishop. At the proclamation of Mary, the bells rang out in peals; the organ was again allowed to sound, and *Te Deum* was sung with full chorus. A preacher of the old creed ventured too far. He was inveighing against Ridley, and denouncing the incarceration of Bonner, when the crowd shouted, "He preaches damnation; pull him down, pull him down!" and a dagger hurled at him struck the side posts of the pulpit. It was with difficulty that he was rescued from danger, and that the tumult was appeased. The Mass was now restored, and on St. Paul's Day, January 25th, 1553, there was a grand procession of ecclesiastics, with fifty copes of cloth of gold, and a solemn celebration. Convocation met at St. Paul's in October, and discussed fiercely for six days the doctrine of the Real Presence. Bonner was restored, and *he* restored the rood. This was in preparation for a magnificent reception of the King Consort, Philip of Spain, on October 18, 1554. A still grander reception was given to the Queen's cousin, Pole, the last English cardinal recognised by Englishmen. It was the season of Advent, and Gardiner, preaching from the text, "Brethren, now is the time

to awake from sleep," exhorted those who had slept during twenty years of darkness to awake, now that the light was once more restored to them. As he spoke of the miseries brought on the nation by heresies, his audience groaned and wept. The chief heresy was the renunciation of the Papal supremacy; and Gardiner in the pulpit, and Bonner on his throne, alike quietly ignored their part in the "Book of True Obedience." Then came thanksgivings for the promise of an heir; thanksgivings for the birth of an heir; a few hours later to be turned into lamentation by the death of the babe, the first and the last of that generation of Tudors. There were many brilliant processions in Mary's reign. These spectacles were varied by others as ghastly as those were gorgeous. There were the hangings and quarterings of the rebels who rose with Wyatt; there were the *autos-da-fé* at Smithfield. St. Paul's gave more than one notable martyr, not only its Bishop Ridley, who died at Oxford, but also a canon, "the worthy proto-martyr of the English Church, John Rogers." The biography of Rogers is most interesting. We have not space even to summarise it, but can only say that Dean Milman makes out a good case for identifying Rogers with the editor of "Matthews's Bible;" so that Rogers was also the proto-martyr of the English Bible.\* It was not a co-religionist of his, but Noailles, the Catholic French Ambassador, who said that Rogers went to his death as though it were to his wedding.

"Rogers," adds Dean Milman, "thus stamped into the hearts of Englishmen that horror of Papal cruelty, that settled aversion to the religion of Rome, which centuries of milder manners have not yet effaced, which has broken forth on occasions in frightful paroxysms, has obstinately resisted the admonitions of wisdom and charity. 'No Popery' became a household word, and has held asunder (alas, too long) the unmingling, or rarely mingling sections of the English, people who, nevertheless, both profess to worship Christ, and to draw their faith and doctrines from the Gospel of Christ."—*Annals*, p. 245.

On November 13th, 1558, Mary signed a proclamation ordering heretics to be burnt whom the Church (which by a hypocritical fiction would not soil itself with blood) delivered over to the secular arm. On November 17th, Mary died. On November 19th, Cardinal Pole, her trusty counsellor, died. There was much excitement, and boundless speculation as to the policy of Elizabeth. Much to the impatience of the

\* Canon Westcott, in his *History of the Bible*, denies the identity; it is upheld by Professor Plumptre.

people, the leading journal, that is to say, the leading pulpit, remained silent for several months. It was part of wise Cecil's policy to do nothing rashly. So the Marian rites went on in St. Paul's, save that, in obedience to a royal proclamation, the Epistle and the Gospel were read in English. Bonner was once more deprived and imprisoned. In August, 1559, the Queen's commissioners held their visitation at the cathedral, and ordered it to be purged of its superstitions. Few of the chapter appeared, and several members were declared contumacious. Bonner was succeeded by Grindal, and he and several other bishops were consecrated at the same time by Archbishop Parker. The new bishops had a difficult part to play. They had, in the first place, to suppress all remembrance of the persecution of their co-religionists—Ridley, Rogers, and the rest. If this was difficult, they had a still harder task to shape their conduct so as to prevent any revival of the persecution. Elizabeth was like her father, imperious and uncertain. The boy, Edward, had been only a tool in the hands of those political reformers whose zeal for the new faith was strong because it was so abundantly rewarded by the promise of the life that now is. The woman, Elizabeth, so far from being a tool in the hands of others, was self-willed and arbitrary to a degree that must often have made her courtiers tremble and reminded them of the days of Henry VIII., when Papalists and anti-Papalists suffered at the same stake. It was still doubtful if Elizabeth would decide for the old faith or for the new. The crucifix was still erected in her private chapel, and candles still burnt before it. She did not seem to know her own mind. Yet there was one article of faith on which she had no doubt—her own supremacy. Dean Milman says:—

"This was her Palladium, and it was theirs. Wisely in their own day did they submit to the supremacy of the Crown. Wisely, in my judgment as regards the life of the Anglican Church. This supremacy, however it may have been overstretched by Elizabeth herself, abused or attempted to be abused by later sovereigns, has been the one great guarantee for the freedom of the English Church. It has saved us from sacerdotalism in both its forms. From Episcopal Hildebrandism, which, through the school of Andrews and Laud, brought the whole edifice to prostrate ruin; from Presbyterian Hildebrandism, which ruled the sister kingdom with a rod of iron, and however congenial to, however fostering some of the best points of the Scottish character, made her religious annals, if glorious for resistance to foreign tyranny, a dark domestic tyranny, a sad superstition which refused all light, and was in fact a debasing priestly tyranny. In

England the royal supremacy settled down into the supremacy of the law—law administered by ermine, not by lawn; by dispassionate judges, by a national court of justice; not by a synod of bishops and a clamorous convocation.”—*Annals*, pp. 268, 269.

At the outset, the Anglican clergy did little credit to their order. There were a few men of erudition and saintly lives. But the majority were ignorant in mind, and coarse in manner. They were split up by divisions and schisms moreover. These were scarcely the men to supersede the Romish priests in the affections of the people. Puritanism made great way. It invaded the cathedral. At the very time that Tallis was composing his noble chants, a proposition was made in convocation to prohibit organs, and was lost by only one vote; Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, being in the minority.

In 1561, a terrible calamity befel the cathedral. During a terrific thunderstorm the church of St. Martin, Ludgate-hill, was struck by lightning, and, while the stones were still toppling down upon the pavement, the lightning was seen to flash into an aperture of St. Paul's. The steeple was of wood, covered with lead. The fire burned downwards for four hours with irresistible force, the bells melted, the timber blazed, the stones crumbled and fell. The lead flowed down in sheets of flame, threatening, but happily not damaging the organ. The fire ran along the roof, which fell in, filling the whole church with a mass of ruin. Of course, each party saw in this calamity a work of Divine anger against its opponent, just as nearly three centuries later the Low Church party saw in the Irish famine a punishment for Sabbath breaking, and the High Church party the penalty for neglecting the saints' days; just as, later still, the one attributed the cholera to the Divine wrath at the admission of Jews into Parliament, and the other to the same anger at the Gorham Judgment. It is fortunate that theories of this sort rarely interfere with practical measures. Whatever the fire at St. Paul's meant, it was clear to churchmen that they were bound to restore their cathedral. The Lord Mayor set an example of energy, and chiefly to that was due the speedy though partial restoration which enabled worship to be performed in the November after the conflagration. The steeple was never restored, and the less urgent portions of the restoration were carried on for many years. Elizabeth expressed indignation because they were not more promptly executed. But the citizens pleaded that they were heavily burdened in order to supply the Queen's subsidies. They might have added, that her majesty herself had set but

a feeble example of liberality in giving only 1,000 marks. All the dioceses in the kingdom subscribed more or less towards the work. One good thing Elizabeth did. She issued a proclamation forbidding the carrying on of business in St. Paul's. Unfortunately, the proclamation proved only idle thunder. "Paul's Walk" still remained the exchange where the speculators of that time made their bargains; was still the lounging place for the idle and hungry, for knaves, thieves, ruffians, and profligate women. Much of this profanity had gone on even while the frequent and solemn Roman services had been held; it became even more flagrant when the few and meagre rites of the Reformation were substituted, and the pulpit became all in all. The cathedral witnessed the drawing of the first lottery in England. A house of timber was erected at the west gate, and here for four months the drawing of 40,000 lots went on. This secularism culminated in the days of the Commonwealth, when Cromwell's troopers stabled their horses in the aisles. They, indeed, were at least sincerely sacrilegious, which is more than can be said of the sharpers and rowdies of Elizabeth's time.

During the reign of James I., St. Paul's was ruled by one of the most famous deans, Dr. Donne, of whom Dean Milman naively says—"He is the only dean of St. Paul's, till a very late successor, who was guilty of poetry." Donne's massive folios of divinity are now read even less than his poetry. There are not many theologians in these days who share the unbounded delight with which Coleridge enjoyed his divinity. In his lifetime Donne was the most popular of preachers, and the vast congregations that he drew together would sit for a whole hour unwearied, enthralled, sometimes even moved to tears by language that seems to us stilted and full of far-fetched conceits. Laud held the Bishopric of London on his way from Bath and Wells to Canterbury. He took in hand the building works at St. Paul's with all his usual energy. Inigo Jones was then at the height of his fame, and he was commissioned to "restore" the cathedral. He did worse for it even than Wren did for the abbey a few years later. He renewed the sides with a very bad Gothic, ruthlessly destroying some of the most characteristic work of the early builders, and he added a Roman portico, beautiful in itself, but utterly out of place. The Anglo-Catholic movement of that time had not identified itself with Gothic architecture. This portico was built at the cost of a wealthy citizen, Sir Paul Pindar, who gave £10,000 towards the restoration. The

structure was intended as an ambulatory, in which the money-changers, who had hitherto occupied the temple itself, might, by way of compromise, be accommodated. Dean Milman sees in the work of Inigo Jones a visible representation of Laud's ecclesiastical theory. "It was altogether an inharmonious and confused union of conflicting elements, a compromise between the old and the new, with services timidly approaching Catholicism, but rejecting their vital and obsolete doctrines, and with an episcopal popedom at Lambeth, not at Rome." It was one of Laud's good deeds that he discovered early the merits of Jeremy Taylor, then a divinity lecturer at St. Paul's, and obtained his first preferment for him. When Laud became primate he obtained the See of London for a man who, though very different from him, was his protégé. William Juxon survived his patron, and ministered to his royal master on the scaffold at Whitehall.

Eight years before "that memorable scene" there had been an ominous debate in the House of Commons. In 1641, the year of Strafford's execution, it was proposed to abolish cathedral chapters, and devote their revenues to some useful purpose. A bill embodying the proposal passed through the Commons, but, the bishops not being yet excluded from the Upper House, it was dropped by the Lords. In 1642, the copes in Westminster and St. Paul's were ordered to be burnt, and the gold with which they were decorated was directed to be used for the relief of the poor in Ireland. In January 1664-5, came an order converting the deanery into a prison. A few years later the cathedral was turned into a barrack and a stable. And what of the famous Cross?—

"It might have been supposed that Paul's Cross, from which so many sermons had been preached in the course of years—some as freely condemnatory of Popish superstition as the most devout Puritan could have wished—that the famous pulpit which we might have expected Presbyterian and Independent divines, the most powerful and popular, would have aspired to fill, and from thence hoped to sway to their own purposes, and to guide to assured salvation the devout citizens of London, would have been preserved as a tower of strength to the good cause. But it was a cross, and a cross was obstinately, irreclaimably, Popish. Down it went, not a vestige of the splendid work of Bishop Kemp was allowed to remain. Its place knew it no more; tradition alone pointed to where it stood. It never rose again."—*Annals*, p. 354.

Iconoclasm may be as superstitious as fetishism.

With the restoration, Juxon became primate, Sheldon Bishop of London. To Sheldon, Oxonians owe their famous



theatre; to Sheldon the English Church owes "the Act of Uniformity," and Nonconformists "Black Bartholomew." Though the Bishop and the Dean were restored to St. Paul's, the cathedral itself was in imminent danger of coming to the ground. The Bishop and the Dean consulted a very remarkable man. He was the nephew of a bishop, who was the sharer of Laud's captivity, and all but the sharer of his execution. The nephew was a ripe scholar, but above all he was famous for his scientific knowledge, which was so great that he was appointed professor of astronomy at Oxford, and Gresham professor of astronomy in London. He also took to architecture, and in that, as in everything else, obtained the foremost place. This paragon of learning and genius was, at the time that Bishop Sheldon consulted him about St. Paul's, Dr. Wren, afterwards to become famous as Sir Christopher Wren. He made a careful survey of the cathedral, and sent in a very comprehensive report. The plans and estimates were ordered on August 27, 1666. Six days later, September 2, broke out the great fire. What that fire was, we have the evidence of Pepys, Evelyn, and Dr. Taswell to tell us. At one time the line of flames was two miles long. The smoke extended fifty miles. The cinders of the burnt books in St. Paul's were carried by the wind as far as Eton. The light from the burning cathedral was so intense that it enabled Taswell to read a small edition of *Terence* on Westminster Bridge.

The cathedral seemed almost to be scorched by the great heat before the flames actually took possession of it. During its destruction the lightning played around the doomed building. The morning after the fire Taswell walked to St. Paul's, but found the heat almost insufferable, and the torrid air nearly made him faint. The ground scorched his shoes. He had a narrow escape from the tumbling walls, and made the best of his way out, after filling his pockets with bell metal, and witnessing the horrid spectacle of a decrepit old woman who, having fled to the cathedral for safety, was burned to coal. Pepys visited the ruins on the 7th. He found large stones split asunder or calcined by the intense heat, six acres of lead roof totally melted, the ruins of the vaulted roof broken through into the subterranean church of St. Faith; but, strange to say, the lead over the altar at the east end remained untouched, and among the monuments the body of one bishop—Braybrooke—remained entire. "Thus," concludes Pepys, "lay in ashes that most venerable church, one of the most ancient pieces of early piety in the Christian world, besides near one hundred more."

We have seen that the fire of 1561, being caused by lightning, was attributed by rival religionists to the Divine anger against their opponents. The same spirit made fervid Protestants attribute the fire of 1666 to the incendiarism of the Papalists. Pepys being Secretary to the Navy, and his head full of invading Netherlanders (who somewhat later did burn Chatham), ascribed the catastrophe to the Dutch. Sancroft, then Dean of St. Paul's, deprecated both religious and national animosities. "Evelyn," says Dean Milman, "while with wise piety he bows before the hand of God, presumes not to penetrate the counsel of His providence. Yet in one significant sentence Evelyn betrays the thoughts of his heart. 'Fifth of September the fire crossed towards Whitehall, but, oh! the confusion there was in that court.'" Confusion indeed, but no contrition. Nearly twenty years were to pass—twenty years of debauchery more depraved than ever before the terrible Sunday at Whitehall, when death set his seal on the royal voluptuary.

Sancroft's fervent piety clung to the cathedral even in its ruins. He dreamt of restoring the old waste places. He fitted up a temporary choir, and preached a sermon that was almost sublime from the text, "Praised be God who hath shown me marvellous great kindness, not," as he added, "in a strong city, but in a very weak and mean one." In the midst of the wreck he spoke of God's compassions, of the kindness that there was in the chastisement, and how the flames had consumed the wretched streets and prepared the way for a nobler city. The cathedral, no less than the city, was to be rebuilt. Its ancient walls, which Sancroft, would fain have preserved, came tumbling about him two years after the fire; and then its fate was sealed. Wren, who just before the fire had been called upon to restore, was now summoned to rebuild. In his former plan he had recommended a dome, not, by any means, a suitable addition to the old building. In the new he had the fullest scope for his lofty imagination. Nor can we regret the disappearance of old St. Paul's. It had little beauty of detail, little grandeur of design. Dean Milman declares that of England's more glorious cathedrals none could be so well spared as this. Excepting its vast size it had nothing to distinguish it. It was gloomy, ponderous, inharmonious; and Inigo Jones had made the church look more unbeautiful than before by the addition of his fine, but most incongruous, portico. The new cathedral was undertaken as a national work. Yet it was not till November 12th, 1673—more than seven years after the fire—

that letters patent under the Great Seal were issued, declaring that it would become necessary to raze the old building to the ground, and that it was intended to erect a new one which would "equal if not exceed the splendour and magnificence of the former cathedral church, when it was in its best estate; and so become, much more than formerly, the principal ornament of our royal city, to the honour of our Government and this our realm." Six commissioners were appointed, Wren was selected as surveyor-general of works and buildings, and the cost was to be defrayed partly by subscriptions to be raised throughout the kingdom, partly by taxation on the cities of London and Westminster. King Charles headed the list with £1,000 per annum; but like a royal duke of more modern times, he looked upon himself as a decoy-duck only, and by no means bound to pay. He did, indeed, make two donations, yet not out of his privy purse, for upon that his sultanas had prior claims. One of these donations was entered as "Green-Wax Forfeitures," a scarcely more intelligible item than some appointments in the royal household of our own time. Some of the bishops contributed largely; parochial subscriptions came in from all parts of England. But in the main, the work was not the result of free offering. The chief expenditure was borne by the coal duty, that long-enduring tax, which is even now paying for the Thames Embankment. The duty seems to have been 6s. per chaldron, of which 3s. went to the City, 13½d. to the churches, and 4½d. to St. Paul's. Dean Milman aptly remarks that the coal had its revenge on the public buildings, especially on St. Paul's, by the damage it did, and still does, by its smoke. The receipts for the cathedral from August 5th, 1664, to March, 1685, amounted to £126,604 6s. 5d; the disbursements to £124,261 4s. 11d. The total cost up to the time of completion was £736,752 2s. 3¼d.

In the year before the fire, Wren made a journey to France. He studied the Louvre, Versailles, Fontainebleau, and described them with felicitous judgment. He said not a word of the great Gothic cathedrals of Amiens, Chartres, Rouen, Rheims. Perhaps he did not think them worth going out of his way to see. He was equally silent about Notre Dame, which he must have seen. The truth is, that Gothic architecture throughout Europe was dead. St. Peter's was then the unrivalled pride of the Christian world, the all-acknowledged model of church architecture. To rival it was the highest aspiration of the great Protestant architect. St. Peter's was building under about twenty Popes. St. Paul's was begun and finished by the same

architect under the same bishop. Had Wren only been allowed fair play, the pile, noble as it is, would have been nobler still. He intended to have had a wide open esplanade and a fine approach to the church. But before he could stake out the streets, the proprietors of the ground began to build with such speed that it became hopeless for Wren to obtain possession of land which, even at that time, was enormously valuable. Thus he lost the opportunity of giving St. Paul's surroundings worthy to be compared with those of St. Peter's. Wren offered two designs: one, a Greek cross, which he preferred, failed to please the commission, who did not consider it sufficiently of a cathedral form; the other was a Latin cross, and is the actual design. King James, when Duke of York, is said to have insisted on the recesses along the aisles of the nave, foreseeing the time when the Romish worship would take possession of the new cathedral, and then the line of chapels, wanting only their altars, would be ready for the daily masses. Before he began to build, Wren carefully examined the ground. He dug as though he intended to build for eternity. First he came upon an ancient cemetery, then upon hard pot earth, then loose dry sand, then water and sand mixed with sea shells, the level of low-water mark. He continued boring until he came to hard beach, and still under that till he came to the "natural hard clay which lies under the city, and county, and Thames, far and wide." The layer of loose sand beneath the "pot earth" was a source of real danger happily discovered. Even now it must not be allowed to escape our memory. It was in consequence of this that Mr. Cockerell, the late surveyor to the cathedral, came to the dean and chapter in great alarm when the works for the construction of a deep sewer were commenced, and that these works were stopped. This loose sand was not Wren's only difficulty. In digging for his foundations, he unexpectedly came upon a pit where the pot earth had been broken by potters in former times. He was advised to use piles, but he refused; he was building for all time; and so he sank a square pier of solid masonry down to the beach beneath low-water mark; and building it up till he came within 15 feet of the present ground, "he turned a short arch underground to the former foundation which was broken off by the untoward accident of the pit." It is on this foundation that the north-east corner of the choir stands. For his foundation-stone, Wren chose a stone of the old cathedral bearing the word *Resurgam*, and which the workmen had discovered among the ruins. He himself laid that stone, June 21st, 1675, without any state or

ceremonial. Twenty-two and a half years later, December 2nd, 1697, saw the cathedral opened for Divine worship. That was a great event in itself for Londoners; it was connected with an event in which all Europe was concerned—the Peace of Ryswick. The thanksgiving for the peace and the opening of the cathedral were combined in one festival. Three hundred thousand jubilant people crowded the streets, and it was with the utmost difficulty that King William could make his way to St. Paul's. The city magnates were present in all their civic pomp. The Bishop, Compton, sat on the throne which Grinling Gibbons had adorned; and the new organ pealed forth for the first time. Compton preached from the verse: "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go up into the house of the Lord." This was the first of many thanksgivings which St. Paul's was destined to witness. Seven times Queen Anne went in state to return thanks for the victories which her great captains, Marlborough and his contemporaries, won for her. She might have made an eighth pilgrimage, but had grown too unwieldy to do so; and in July, 1713, returned thanks in her own closet for the peace of Utrecht. Three years before this, the man who had laid the foundation stone laid also the top stone. It is not indeed quite clear whether he himself, or his son, actually placed the highest stone of the cupola; but at least he was present, and may have looked down from one of his lofty galleries upon such a series of trophies as few architects have beheld. There was much to vex him, for instead of seeing the spacious streets of the city, each converging to its centre, he saw London spring up again in irregular and narrow labyrinths of close dark lanes; he saw his own cathedral jostled and crowded by mean and unworthy buildings. But he saw also all the stately churches that he had built, Greenwich Hospital, Chelsea Hospital, and many other public buildings which had risen under his hands. If there was enough to fill him with pride when he stood at that lofty elevation, he found enough to humble him when he descended. He was shamefully treated by his employers. They thwarted him, and vexed him in every conceivable way. They modified his designs in defiance of all architectural canons. They accused him of negligence, delay, and even corruption. They kept him for a time without his salary. At last they dismissed him, and put over his head a man whom, a little afterwards, they petitioned King George to dismiss. Wren had consolation in his sorrow. He withdrew to a house near Hampton Court, within view of another of his works, and passed the last five years of his life (he lived

to 92) in contemplation and study, "well pleased to die in the shade as in the light."

We have spoken of the architect by whom, we must speak of the bishop under whom, this great work was accomplished. Henry Compton was high born. He had been a soldier and a traveller before he took orders. He, the son of the Earl of Northampton and the guardsman, was entrusted with the religious education of the Princesses Mary and Anne, and retained no little influence over them when they became queens. He spoke in favour of the bill for excluding their father, the Duke of York, from the throne. He had to appear before and to be insulted by Jeffries, because he had refused to suspend, in compliance with a royal order, Dr. Sharp for preaching a sermon against the Church of Rome. He was deposed, and thus was not sent to the Tower with the seven bishops. He took a bold step. He alone of the episcopate appears among the list of the seven nobles who signed the invitation to the Prince of Orange. He took an active part in protecting the Princess Anne when James had to flee. The wits of the day made merry because the Bishop reassumed his military vestments. Sancroft having refused to take the oath of allegiance, it was Compton's high duty and privilege to crown King William and Queen Mary. He reckoned upon taking Sancroft's place at Lambeth as well as at Westminster. It was a bitter disappointment to him when his own dean, Tillotson, a man in every way, however, except political services, superior to him, was promoted over his head. The deans of St. Paul's, at this eventful epoch, were men of the highest attainments. First and most learned of all was Stillingfleet. Then followed Tillotson, unquestionably one of the most famous divines whom the English Church has ever produced, and a man who had the most powerful influence on his generation. He was followed by Sherlock, whose appointment caused the greatest commotion, for he had been one of the non-jurors. His conversion was followed by his promotion, and his promotion by the publication of a book, in which he justified his conversion. That did not silence his enemies; they attributed his backsliding to the influence of his ambitious wife; and when he published a work on the Trinity, they accused him of tri-theism, and said, with cruel epigram, "No wonder that Dr. Sherlock can swear allegiance to more than one king, when he can swear to more than one God."

The great conflict of two rival churches was now ended. Sherlock's acceptance of the deanery showed how completely



the attempt to restore the Roman faith had failed. The Church had peace and something more. It became somnolent, torpid, cold; it was to be roused from its slumbers by Wesley and Whitfield in the last century, and by Newman and Pusey in our own time. And yet the period of hybernation was not without its use. If the services of the Church were stately and frigid, if the clergy were too often only students or men of fashion, the abstinence from controversy between church and church gave time for the production of masterly works bearing upon the fundamental principles of Christianity. Butler was Dean of St. Paul's before he became Bishop of Durham. It is superfluous to speak of the *Analogy*, or of the *Sermons*. They are a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰῶν*, as much as *Hamlet* and the *In Memoriam*. They were not the only great achievements by Pauline dignitaries. Thus Sherlock, Bishop of London, son of Dean William, preached sermons that were long held to be the model of English eloquence. Lowth, the commentator on the Psalms, who feared not to do battle with the turbulent Warburton, was also Bishop of London. Among Lowth's successors in the deanery was Thomas Secker, the son of Dissenting parents, the only one who lived to become Archbishop of Canterbury. He must have had considerable abilities to overcome the disadvantages of his birth; nevertheless, his works are scarcely likely to be much known a century hence. Of recent bishops and deans, Dr. Milman declines to speak. We, however, cannot refrain from paying a tribute of respect to the liberal and energetic prelate who has just left the arduous duties of the See of London for the more conspicuous position of Metropolitan; and to the large-minded dean whose posthumous work we have been reviewing, and who was one of the most accomplished scholars of his time. It is not often that a cathedral sustains two such losses in the course of a few weeks, the loss of such a bishop and of such a dean.

A century and a half is but a short period in the history of a nation so ancient as England. Thus there has been little opportunity for New St. Paul's to acquire a history of its own. With royalty the Metropolitan Cathedral has had little to do. Anne, as we have seen, went thither to return thanks for Blenheim and the other victories which her great captains had won for her. On the accession of the House of Brunswick, George I. and the Prince and the Princesses went in state to St. Paul's. Three-quarters of a century passed before the next royal visit, and then the three estates of the realm gathered together beneath the

dome to return thanks for the restoration of George III. to sanity. Eight years later, the same king attended to offer thanksgiving for the naval victories of that time. The imposing part of this, the last of the royal visits, was the bearing of the captured French, Dutch, and Spanish flags by British admirals and captains. Previously to this there had been a funeral pageant of almost royal magnificence. Sir Joshua Reynolds, the most honoured of English painters, had been borne to the cathedral. A hundred carriages followed the hearse; three dukes and six other peers acted as pall-bearers. Subsequently to the last visit of sovereignty, came that sad and solemn day when England broke off from her rejoicing at the greatest naval victory ever won for her, in order to mourn for him who had died in winning it. Dean Milman, then a boy, was present, and heard the low wail of the sailors as they encircled the remains of their beloved admiral. Dean Milman it was who officiated at the funeral of the Duke of Wellington, nearly half a century later. Nelson, by a strange chance, lies in the sarcophagus intended for Wolsey. It was designed and executed for the cardinal by the famous Torregiano. It lay for centuries neglected in Wolsey's chapel at Windsor. Just at this time, George III. was preparing to make this chapel a cemetery for his family. What was to be done with what had been thrown aside as useless lumber? It was suggested, and the suggestion was accepted, that it should be used to encase the coffin of Nelson.

There is no cathedral in England more fit to be the Wal-halla of English worthies than St. Paul's. The chapels which Papal James caused to be constructed with the view of doing worship to the saints, are, under a Protestant *régime*, admirably adapted for commemorating the deeds of heroes. Yet it was long before the authorities of the cathedral could be induced to suffer the intrusion of statues into a building so thoroughly in harmony with them. The first statue admitted was not that of statesman, warrior, or sovereign, but that of a philanthropist—John Howard. The ice of prejudice broken, this example was soon followed. At the earnest request of Sir Joshua Reynolds, his friend, Samuel Johnson, was the next to be honoured, and in him literature was honoured. Art was honoured in Reynolds himself; learning in Sir W. Jones, the first great Oriental scholar. Then came the distinguished host of soldiers and sailors, from Rodney to Napier; the great administrators of our Indian Empire, from Cornwallis to Lawrence; a statesman or two like

Melbourne; a saintly bishop, like Heber; Hallam, the historian; Turner the painter, who threatened to be buried in his "Carthage" for shroud; and though last, not least, Henry Hart Milman himself, at once poet, scholar, historian, and divine. But as yet there is only a scanty population within our Walhalla. The statues are few in proportion to the enormous space which St. Paul's affords. There is room here for the chiefs of that great multitude of Englishmen who, we doubt not, will hereafter arise to serve God in church and state—in the senate or on the bench, let us hope, rather than at the head of the army, or in the van of the squadron. The abbey is essentially the church of the past; the cathedral is no less essentially the church of the future—a future whose conquests will be won over poverty and ignorance, over pain and sin, whose victories will have no mourners, but bring greater happiness to the vanquished even than to the victors.

---

- ART. IV.—1. *The Church's Creed, or the Crown's Creed? A Letter to the Most Rev. Archbishop Manning.* By EDMUND S. FFOULKES, B.D. Ninth Thousand. London: T. Hayes, Eaton-square.
2. *Experiences of a 'Vert.* Reprinted from the *Union Review.* Hayes.
3. *Christendom's Divisions.* Part I. Being a Philosophical Sketch of the Divisions of the Christian Family in East and West. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. Longmans. 1865.
4. *Christendom's Divisions.* Part II. *Greeks and Latins.* Being a Full and Connected History of their Dissensions and Overtures for Peace down to the Reformation. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. London: Longmans. 1867.

OF all the motives which have concurred to seduce Anglicans into the Roman Communion, there is none which has operated more extensively or more powerfully than the yearning after visible and organic, traditional and historic, unity for the Christian Church. It has been taken for granted that to be real and historic the unity must be visible and organic. To attain to this unity has been the dream and passion of Anglicans. This is the *ignis fatuus* always hovering over the uncertain and treacherous ground that lies between Oxford and Rome, which has allured crowds of earnest and cultivated, although often, also, like Mr. Ffoulkes, imperfectly educated and disproportionately developed men, from the dim and antique seclusion of a semi-monastic university life to the ancient other-world fastnesses of Papal Rome, as claiming to be the "mother and mistress of churches." Having long gazed wistfully from Oxford, having been fascinated by the seeming vision of unity, having floundered long and wearily amidst the wavering uncertainties of Anglican Catholicism, with its vain pretensions and futile puerilities, they have at length made their escape from the mid-region of shifting lights and treacherous footing by betaking themselves to the causeway—of late years well beaten by the feet of perverts— which the Roman engineers have laid across the bog. This causeway has been built on the same principle on which Stephenson fixed his railway firmly over the quaking depths of Chat Moss. The great railway-maker knew that all that he needed to do was to cast into the bog material enough. The

process might be very long, the consumption of material immense. But in the end his ground, he knew, must be made good, and his railway should and would be laid. So the Roman doctors, by dint of heaping assumption upon assumption, and, as Mr. Ffoulkes has found out at last (how wonderful that it should have taken him nearly thirty years to make this discovery!) forgery upon forgery, have made a solid seeming causeway on which to conduct inquirers after truth and unity into their own lines. There is, however, this difference between the case of the railway and that of the Roman arguments and pretensions—beneath the shaking moss that underlies Stephenson's line there is the firm deep basis and centre of the earth itself, upbearing all, whereas underneath the cunning fabric of peculiarly Roman invention and sophistry there is no foundation of truth whatever. All is false and unreal; false in metaphysics, but yet more flagrantly false in ecclesiastical assumption and historical invention. Mr. Ffoulkes' pamphlet, although he is still Romanist in dogma, is a striking demonstration of the ecclesiastical falsity and imposture which invests the whole fabric of Romish usurpation and dominion.

Of Archbishop Manning it was emphatically true that what led him to join the Church of Rome was mainly his passionate longing after "unity," according to that mistaken conception of which we have spoken. This was a subject on which he dwelt much whilst he was Archdeacon of Chichester. Archdeacon Hare, his fellow-archdeacon in the diocese, dedicated to Archdeacon Manning his own admirable sermon on the "Unity of the Church," precisely because the theme was one on which his colleague insisted so often and so strongly, and at the same time held views so fundamentally at variance, as Hare believed, with the true spirit of Protestantism. According to Manning, a true "unity" could not be fully realised, except in connection with a visible "uniformity" of outward aspect and development. This was the view which he insisted upon in his sermons and in his charges, and especially in his work on *The Unity of the Church*. And, with this outward and visible unity before his imagination, he was dazzled and enamoured. "Unity," says Archdeacon Hare, in the prolonged dedication to which we have referred, "the unity of the Church is of all things the dearest to your heart, at least only subordinate to, or rather co-ordinate with truth, without which, you well know, all unity must be fallacious; and as that which fills the heart will overflow from the lips, you yourself several times since

this sermon was preached, have poured out your earnest thoughts and desires for the unity of the Church." At this time Manning was one of the most beloved and admired men among the High Anglican party in this country. Hare, utterly as he differed from him, was very warmly attached to him. "Your wisdom," he says, "under God, has been our chief guide; your eloquence has stirred our hearts; your loving spirit has checked and healed the first outbreaks of anything like division."\*

Holding by this *πρώτον ψεύδος* of an assumed external and visible unity, and therefore continuity, as one of the necessary "notes" and properties of the true Church of Christ, it is no wonder that Anglicans found themselves compelled to move Romewards unrestingly till they reached their goal in the Papal city. For, on their principles, either the Anglican Church is the one Apostolic and Catholic Church, the Church of Rome being corrupt, heretical, and schismatic, and the Greek Church being schismatic, if not also corrupt; or the Anglican and the Greek Churches, being separated and held apart only through the schismatic perversity of Rome, are at root one and the same, and may be regarded as virtually the two branches of the one true and Apostolic Church; or the Anglican, Greek, and Roman Churches, together with any other orthodox churches which are lineally descended from the primitive and patristic Church, are branches of the one Catholic Church. But the first of these alternatives, making the Anglican to be the one true Church of the world, is really too absurd to gain a footing among reasonable theories, especially in face of the fact that the Church of England was, for centuries, only a part of the Roman Catholic Communion. The second falls to the ground for the same reason; if the Anglican Church has no real *locus standi* in its ecclesiastical pedigree and pretensions apart from the great communion with which it was for centuries identified, as bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh, it cannot assume to join hands with the orthodox Greek Church as a twin sister, apart from the Church which it so long clung to as its "mother and mistress," especially when the Greek Church repels it as graceless and schismatic; and, as for the third view, to which Dr. Pusey still holds, to which Archbishop Manning and his disciple—Mr. Ffoulkes—clung as long as they could, there is against it this ominous fact, that the Roman Catholic Church holds the Anglican Church to be excommunicate, while the English has

---

\* *Hare's Miscellaneous Pamphlets.* Macmillan and Co.



deliberately and explicitly separated from the Roman Communion. The Anglican Church is not merely (as Dr. Pusey says) "independent of" the Roman, as the African was in the days of Augustine. The Anglican Church is cut off from the Roman Communion; to which it must be added, as already noted, that the Anglican Church is held by Eastern Orthodoxy not only to be schismatic, but to be destitute of sacramental grace. An Anglican, accordingly, however much he may long to enter into the haven of unity, to become identified with the one visible Church, which, as he conceives, is the heir "of exceeding great and precious promises," of Divine authority and celestial glory, finds himself, if he is determined to be thoroughly consistent, in a condition of painful and perilous isolation, such as he cannot reconcile with his principles, and which does violence to his deepest and most passionate aspirations.\*

Here, then, we trace the cause which has operated perhaps more extensively than any other in constraining Anglicans to become Romanists. It is not, indeed, the only cause. Some have yielded to a sterner compulsion. The austere sovereignty of "dogma," and the demands of intense spirits for "discipline," have forced some, against all their tastes and all their human heart, to leave Oxford for Rome. Only under the absolute authority of Rome could these keen and restless

\* In the preface to the first part of *Christendom's Divisions*, writing on the "Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1865," Mr. Ffoulkes, holding still by his *πρωτον ψευδος*, shows how it hampers all parties, and continues to hamper him. "It may be, therefore, that things will become still more paradoxical than they are. According to the ancient creeds, there is but one Holy Catholic Church upon earth—that is, according to the Roman Catholic theory, that body which is in communion with the Pope. Nor, indeed, according to facts, is there any other body capable of having the epithets 'one' and 'Catholic' both applied to it with any truth. But it is part of that theory likewise that heretical baptism is valid. In that case, therefore, there are about half as many baptized Christians outside the Church as there are in it. According to the Greek theory, baptism, to be valid, must have been administered in the Greek Church. In that case both Catholics and Protestants can belong to no church at all, and are not even Christians. According to the Protestant theory there are as many churches as there are Christian communities. In that case there can be no Catholic Church at all that is one. For destructive purposes it is curious to observe how all three theories act in harmony." Mr. Ffoulkes's own conclusion and solution seems to be that, on the basis of a common hierarchical descent and of mutual concession, the different branches of the "Catholic" Church should enter in communion with each other, all agreeing to recognise a certain supremacy of the Roman see in cases of appeal. He does not appear to discern that his recent writings have in fact afforded a *reductio ad absurdum* of his fundamental principle of external and organic ecclesiastical unity; that the consistency and completeness of his argument can only be made good by admitting into the scope of Catholic communion and unity non-hierarchical—e.g. Protestant—churches; and that the final conclusion from the whole must be the abandonment of the "hierarchical" doctrines of sacramental grace.

souls be held to rest, these fiery searching spirits be subdued to stillness. Such as these, to borrow the words of an eloquent prelate who knows well of what he speaks, have taken their flight "on the wings of an unbounded scepticism into the bosom of an unfathomed superstition." But this was not the case with the Anglican Archdeacon, who is now the titular Archbishop of Westminster, nor with Mr. Ffoulkes, formerly his disciple, but now his keen and determined critic. A passage from the first part of Mr. Ffoulkes' *Christendom's Divisions* will illustrate what we have been saying.

"'From the age of fifteen,' says one of the deepest of living writers (Newman), 'dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion.' The deliberate conviction of a no less deep thinker and good Catholic in past time (De Maistre) was different. 'Were it permitted to establish degrees of importance amongst things of Divine institution,' he says, '*I should place the hierarchy before dogma*, to so great a degree is the former indispensable to the maintenance of the faith. *One may cite, in favour of this theory, a splendid experience which, for three centuries, has been conspicuous in the eyes of all Europe. I mean the Anglican Church, which has preserved a dignity and weight absolutely foreign to all other reformed churches, entirely because the English good sense has preserved the hierarchy.*'"—*Christendom's Divisions*, part i., p. 200.

Even so, "the hierarchy before dogma," for where "the hierarchy" comes, grace and life come with it in necessary connection, whether anything be known of dogma, properly so called, or not; whereas, there may be much of dogma without hierarchy, and therefore without grace; nay, even with the hierarchy in view, and dogma and creed strictly held, it is yet possible no grace may come to the mere dogma-holder. "Hierarchy before dogma," is the maxim of Mr. Ffoulkes still, as it was his maxim when he followed Archdeacon Manning into the Church of Rome. It is and must be the maxim of the High Anglican yet more characteristically than of the Roman Catholic, and that for a reason not very far to seek. The Romanist, who trusts in his Church as the channel of salvation, is accustomed to think broadly of the Church as such. She is to him the Primitive and Apostolic Church, the Catholic Church, the one and only grand and continuous Church which Western Christendom has known; she has antiquity, empire, prestige, tradition; she has queened it among the nations; many blended glories are hers, at least in the view of the good Catholic. What church can compare with her for a moment? There may be heretical churches, poor and maimed and shorn, which affect to be national; but the Roman Catholic Church

is European, is human, is identified with the family of nations. A Romanist, so deeming of his Church, regards her hierarchy as but one among her many glories, and the many sources of her power; but the Anglican Churchman who, at the present day, looking across Great Britain, sees the power, the culture, the intelligence and energy, the wealth and numbers and variety of the non-episcopal churches; in the north, in the south, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist; and feels it to be necessary to vindicate for his own Church sole and supreme legitimacy among them all; feels also, by a ready intuition, that he must look away from all other attributes of a church, whether orthodoxy or eloquence, or missionary zeal, or popular favour, or intellectual gifts, or even the power of godliness, and fix his regards on this one attribute—its hierarchy. The "Apostolical succession" is the alpha and omega of Anglicanism. It was the first instinct of the Oxford party to insist upon and expound this doctrine more than thirty years ago, and Anglicanism, as such, can never outgrow it. The hierarchical dogma furnishes its definition, and sets forth its one prerogative. Mr. Ffoulkes has learnt a great deal during the twenty years and more which have passed since he followed his leader to Rome, but he has not yet learned to unlearn this principle. He still says of the Church of England—"Let the integrity of her Apostolical succession be conceded, and the validity of the administration of her sacraments, one and all, is established." This pamphlet of his, however, which has made so much noise, shows that he is on the way to find out his error on this point as he has on some others. It has taken him more than twenty years of close and original research to discover what he might have learnt not only from any Protestant authority on ecclesiastical history, such for instance as Mosheim, or Campbell, or Gieseler, but from such Catholic authorities as Fleury or Dupin, viz. that the fabric of specifically Papal authority is a structure of usurpations founded upon forgeries, upon the forged donation of Constantine, and the forged decretals of the pseudo Isidore. Thoroughly honest, very learned, pre-eminently a plodding student, it is yet evident that Mr. Ffoulkes has a peculiar talent for working his passage out to truth and daylight by the most circuitous way possible, and after the greatest number of attempts made in false directions. As he is certainly now beginning to make his progress clear and good somewhat more rapidly than he did twenty years ago, it may be hoped that before he publishes his next pamphlet he will have discovered what all besides himself must have discovered already,

and at a glance, that the sound reasoning of the latter part of his pamphlet must, perforce, lift him quite beyond the limits of his hierarchical prescription, and teach him that the grace of sacraments and the grace which comes by truth and faith in the Spirit—and, whether it be through the sacred seal and symbol, or through the Divine word, all grace is by the Truth through the Spirit of humble Faith—that all grace—flows freely wherever Christ's Word is truly taught, and truly believed and obeyed, whether such truth have been ministered by priests or preachers with or without a hierarchy. As we shall not return to this subject of a hierarchy and of Apostolical succession, let us close by citing some words of Archdeacon Hare, which are full of precious and seasonable truth.

"This is the great controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Their stay is the *opus operatum*, ours *fides operans*. Faith, the gift of God, apprehending Him through Christ, renewing the whole man, and becoming the living spring of his feelings, thoughts, and actions." . . . "In fact, the faith of the Romish Church, so far as it differs from ours, is not in spiritual powers and acts, but in magical. A spiritual power acts upon the will and conscience, and through them; a magical power produces its changes arbitrarily, independent of the will and conscience. Such is the baptismal change of nature, as substituted for the new birth. Such is the belief of a string of propositions on the authority of another, without any personal conviction of their truth. Such is the infallibility ascribed to Popes, without any reference to their moral and spiritual condition. The Pope is nothing but a hierarchical Archimagus."—*Contest with Rome*, pp. 172, 151.

We have, in the foregoing remarks, held Mr. Ffoulkes in close connection with Archbishop Manning, because, in fact, they were closely connected together at the outset of their journey from Oxford to Rome, and for long afterwards; because to this connection Mr. Ffoulkes pointedly refers in the pamphlet of which one of the "ninth thousand" of copies published lies before us; because the self-same postulate of external unity, which has brought Mr. Ffoulkes into his present perplexities, has conducted the Archbishop into Ultramontaniam, and so fitted him eminently for such high promotion as has not only carried him far away from Mr. Ffoulkes, who, indeed, has never submitted to reordination, and who is still busy, as for twenty years past, with his survey of the sources and early limits of the Church in the obscure watershed region of ecclesiastical history, but has also lifted him to an eminence from which he can overlook, in his Oratorian seclusion, one who is his senior, in not a few points his

superior, and who, thirty years ago, was his leader; and because, finally, Mr. Ffoulkes having, by the divergent line on which he has travelled from the same starting place, been brought now into a position of something like antagonism to his former master and present ecclesiastical superior, has addressed this pamphlet, in the form of a letter, to the "Most Rev. Archbishop Manning;"—"Archbishop of Westminster," it is to be observed, our English Catholic, Englishman to the core, does *not* call his early teacher and friend.

Mr. Ffoulkes is, in fact, a member *and* a leading spirit in the "Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," of which the *Union Review*, a journal to which Mr. Ffoulkes has contributed, has been regarded as, in some sort, the organ. Against this "Association," Archbishop Manning, about two years ago, addressed a "Pastoral Letter" to his clergy, which, with a number of other "Letters," has since been published by him in a volume entitled "England and Christendom." The Holy Office, moreover, has condemned and prohibited any co-operation on the part of "Catholics" with either the "Association" or the journal which was regarded as its literary organ. Mr. Ffoulkes, accordingly, although still a member of the "Roman Communion"—subject, as an Anglican would say, to the "Roman obedience"—stands, at least, on the borders of "malignancy," if not of heresy, and is committed to a set of opinions and a course of action directly contrary to the prescription of the "Holy Office," and the injunction of his archiepiscopal diocesan. Cardinal Patrizi and the Holy Office insist, and Archbishop Manning is obliged to be their organ and mouthpiece, that "to the Catholic and Roman Church alone belongs the name of Catholic; that to give any other body the name of Catholic is heretical; that all who are separated from the one Catholic Church are in a state of wrath," &c. &c. Mr. Ffoulkes, in this pamphlet, as in his former work on *Christendom's Divisions*, undisguisedly suggests and supports conclusions essentially opposed to these and to all such. Whether he still contributes to the *Union Review* is more than we know; but we presume that he does, for Mr. Hayes, who publishes the *Review*, is the publisher of his pamphlet, and slips recommending the *Review* are sent out with the thousands of the pamphlet. We observe that some of the "Catholic" journals are so angry with Mr. Ffoulkes, that they will not allow him to be a true "Catholic;" and we cannot doubt that his pamphlet has earned for him the honour of having his name inserted in the *Roman Index*.

The following are some of Mr. Ffoulkes' earliest words to Dr. Manning—

"We were neither of us born or bred in the Communion in which we now are. The evidences which determined you to embrace the Communion of the Church of Rome, for the most part determined me likewise. You preceded and I followed: yet I neither followed you nor any one else blindly, as a party leader. According to the best of my judgment, I followed truth whithersoever it led me, and by whomsoever it was suggested. Still, I should be the last to deny—why should I not be always proud to acknowledge?—the many difficulties that I had unravelled for me in my searchings after truth continually by yourself, by the inimitable lucidity and high-souled earnestness of your discourses as a preacher: and by the noble example of devotion and self-sacrifice which you exhibited as a servant of Christ, in acting to the uttermost up to what you believed to be true. The result of it all was that ultimately my convictions led me to follow in your wake; though there are still others, whose profound learning, and honesty, and piety, I have never for one moment ceased to respect equally with your own, as deliberately convinced as ever of the righteousness of the position abandoned by us as untenable so many years ago. I was far from undervaluing their testimony, even when I subscribed to your own in preference: and once removed to our new abode, I must confess my course to have been deliberately the exact opposite to what I believe yours to have been ever since. You, and very many more probably, seemed to have joined the Roman Communion not only pledged never to find fault with it, but to see with its eyes, hear with its ears, understand with its understanding, stand or fall by its judgment. Your argument, I presume, would be that the Church of Rome claims to be infallible: that you submitted yourselves to it as such, in the fullest confidence that its decisions can never mislead you; that they are God's voice speaking to you, which you are bound at the peril of your salvation never to mistrust, much less dispute. I joined the Roman Communion on other grounds, and was accepted. Practically, no doubt, the Church of Rome claims to be infallible, and anybody who concedes, is dearer to her than anybody who disputes, her claim: but I was never required to profess this on entering her Communion, and perhaps might never have entered it, if I had been. 'Sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium ecclesiarum matrem et magistram, agnosco,' a mediæval phrase, of which I knew the full historical value, was the uttermost to which I gave my adhesion. And I said to myself on that occasion, if she is really infallible, she can stand much more searching criticism than the one which I am leaving for her sake, on behalf of which no such claim has ever been made. For I considered that after the extreme rigour with which the claims of the Church of England had been enforced by us all, it would be the height of disingenuousness in us



to shut our eyes to any weak points of the system that we were embracing in preference, should any such exist. I felt that if I found the claims of the Church of Rome to be thoroughly in accordance with facts, I should ever afterwards regard her with tenfold reverence for having verified them myself. But till I had actually been received into communion with Rome, it was my own impression, and I was assured by members of the Roman Communion over and over again, that I could never judge of her system at all fairly or adequately: and this was one of my chief reasons for embracing it when I did. Afterwards I resided in various countries where it was dominant, and studied its worship in town and country, comparing them with what I had abandoned for it at home. Then I returned and set myself to work to improve my previous knowledge of its history in past ages, and its relations with other Churches: paying especial attention to the causes which had produced estrangement between it and them for a time, or till now. All this has been my constant employment for the last dozen years or more: so that I cannot be said to have drawn my conclusions hastily."

We cannot imagine a much more troublesome acquisition to the Church of Rome than such a convert as Mr. Ffoulkes. It is certain that whatever he may have embraced in the doctrine of the Romish Church, he has never given up the principle of "private judgment," and therefore has throughout been but an ambiguous sort of Roman Catholic.

About the time when Dr. Newman published his *Apologia* (in 1864), Mr. Ffoulkes, in the *Union Review*, published some confessions, entitled *Experiences of a 'Vert*, which were hardly in keeping with the character of a dutiful son of the Church. "I repeat," he says, "that the years I have spent as a Roman Catholic have been among the most useless and unedifying of my life; and therefore it is that I feel it to be my duty to speak out to others lacking the same experience. Let nobody quit the Church of England for the Roman Catholic Church, on any other ground than that of a distinct call from God to do so."\* In the same article he asks, evidently with reference to Dr. Newman—

"Has the Roman Catholic hierarchy been the means of unmaking, so far as in them lay, one of still greater name than the saintly Faber, or not less devoted Hutchinson? Is it the system which has sapped his excellence, or is he the same that he was formerly? . . . Why is he, the most gifted intellect of the day, combined with rare piety, the most popular party leader within memory, now in dishonoured retirement—the victim of circumstances or of intrigue, if report says true?"—*Experiences of a 'Vert*, p. 28.

---

\* *Experiences of a 'Vert*, p. 30.

In the same article, besides, he, writing as a Romanist, argues that grace cannot be denied as appertaining to the ministrations of the Anglican Church. If this were not conceded by the Romish doctors, he contends, "the Christian lives of men in the Church of England would be one of those inexorable facts which logic cannot set aside."

This was written in 1864, a year before Mr. Ffoulkes published the first part of his work on *Christendom's Divisions*, three years before he had learnt, in the course of his researches for writing the second part, that the Roman Pontiffs had accepted the *Filioque* in the *Nicene Creed* on the mere compulsion of the Frankish Emperor, that the temporal power of the Pope was falsely based on the forged donation of Constantine, and that the Roman canon law, with all its portentous assumptions rested on the forged and pseudo-Isidorian decretals.

In fact, this inconvenient and unmanageable "chiel" has been, for these many years past, "taking notes" among the "Catholics" into whose community he had entered, and, with dogged honesty, he has persisted in "printing" them.

The leading purpose in his present pamphlet is to furnish or suggest a reply to one of the letters on *The Crown in Council* in that volume of Archbishop Manning's to which we have referred. The Archbishop casts in the teeth of the Anglican Church its Erastianism and the scandal of its having Henry VIII. for its first royal and national head, the humiliations to which as a State-establishment under royal headship it has had for centuries to submit, and, in especial, its present powerlessness and helplessness in the face of heresy and schism. Mr. Ffoulkes volunteers to furnish Dr. Manning's "Anglican friend" with a *tu quoque* argument from which there is no escape. Charlemagne is the Henry VIII. of the Roman Catholic Church, not less unscrupulous, hardly less cruel, in no way a better Christian, and the imponent upon the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church of the *Filioque* addition to the Creed, which made the breach with the Greek Church irreparable, and of much besides.

"I ask you, my Lord, as a plain-spoken Englishman, whether it would be possible to conceive the Creed of the Church more deliberately impugned by the Crown in Council in the teeth of the Pope? I am persuaded at all events that there has been nothing approaching it in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation. Charlemagne, as the mouthpiece of the Council of Frankfort, composed of his own subjects or allies, took formal objec-

tion to the Creed of the Church, as it then stood, and has just been promulgated for the fourth time by a General Council, confirmed by the Pope, because in the article defining the procession of the Holy Ghost it wanted those words 'and from the Son:' and the formal answer of the Pope thus appealed to was, that its explicit teaching was perfect, though it wanted those words.

"Yet the 'Crown in Council,' we must conclude, was more intimately versed in theology than either the Church in Council or the Pope, for it carried its point after all—either this, or the Church of Rome in adopting those words submitted to its dictation: for there is no other alternative."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Thus Reccared inaugurated the addition: Charlemagne patronised it: and Henry II. got it adopted by the Popes themselves. When this had been done, the pontifical oath was changed. Later Popes of course shrank from imprecating a judgment upon themselves, according to the terms of their oath, in case they failed to keep the decrees of the General Councils enumerated in it, '*usque ad unum apicem*,' when they felt they had notoriously failed to do so by the Creed. That clause was accordingly struck out. In the corresponding clause of the oath that was afterwards taken by them—the way in which Cardinals are mentioned in it associates it with the well-known decree of Nicholas II., 1059, respecting the Sacred College—they are made to say simply, May God be merciful to me in that awful day if I do my diligence to keep all these things sworn to by me.' Had it been intended to intimate that they had been now and then forced to do otherwise, it could not have been differently worded."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Long before I joined the Roman Communion, as my books testify—I thought then, and am doubly convinced now, after reading ecclesiastical history through again as a Roman Catholic, that if ever there was a justifiable revolt from authority, it was the revolt we call the Reformation: and most certainly had it been a revolt from a mere secular power, like that of the United States of America from England, I for one should never have dreamt of transferring my allegiance from the Anglican to the Roman Communion, any more than I suppose any citizen of the United States in his sober senses would now dream of transferring his on principle to the British Crown. But all Scripture told me that there should be but one Church: and all history told me that a Primacy from time immemorial in that one Church belonged to the see of Rome: all history told me, moreover, that from the foundation of the see of Canterbury to the Reformation, the Church of England had been one with Rome, had voted freely and deliberately for the doctrine and discipline upheld by Rome, including the supremacy of the Pope, for centuries; and was at least as responsible for the corruptions that had accumulated in the middle ages and precipitated the catastrophe of the sixteenth century, as any other of the Churches in communion with Rome on the Continent. Hence, it certainly seemed to me that the

Church of England had done wrong in separating from the body of which she had been so long a foremost member, and affecting to care for nothing so long as her own boat got off safe, instead of standing manfully by her colours, and assisting by every means in her power to bring the old ship safe into port. At all events, what excuse was there for our continued isolation? If I could trust to the Roman Catholic divines of this country, whose teaching I took to be faithfully reflected in a work entitled the 'Faith of Catholics,' reprinted in 1846, for the third time, by a living dignitary, since promoted, and dedicated to the late Bishop Walsh, I felt there was nothing in the Roman Catholic system *now*, to which I could not honestly, and would not willingly subscribe, for the sake of breaking down the barriers that estranged us from the Churches abroad, with which our forefathers had lived and died in happy communion. It may be that I trusted those divines too implicitly: it is not long since I heard the term 'minimisers' applied from the pulpit by a living preacher, who may be supposed your mouth-piece, to those who believed no more: though it would be difficult to produce any Roman Catholic catechism in use throughout England in which more was taught. But this by the way. More intimate acquaintance with the Continental Churches, and a much more searching investigation into the merits of the schism between the East and West than I had ever been able to give to it before, has modified my views on the whole question considerably between England and Rome. Let me begin with the last first.

"To the facts, which some pages back I put into the mouth of your Anglican friend, you will doubtless remember my calling your attention privately just twelve months ago. Your only reply to me, so far as they were concerned, was that they were already known. This I construed as an admission on your part that I had stated them correctly. But if so, what other inference can be deduced from them, than that for the last 1,000 years the Roman Communion has been committed to the use of a Creed which is not that of the Church, but of the Crown? I do not say *therefore* to the use of a Creed which is heterodox. On the theological question involved in it I would wish to speak with becoming reverence: but this much is certain, that the addition which forms its distinguishing feature was made and had been in use many centuries before any Pope judged it allowable, much less necessary: many centuries before theologians in the West had agreed amongst themselves whether the terms 'mission' and 'procession' were distinguishable. Doubtless it has since found able defenders: but among them there are scarce two who give the same account of it, historically or doctrinally: and some of them are neither consistent with each other nor with themselves. Others, in arguing for it against the Easterns, have grievously mis-stated facts, and numberless passages have been adduced in support of it from the Fathers, either wholly spurious or interpolated. I know of no parallel to it in this respect in any religious controversy, before or since. If the Athanasian Creed was not expressly coined for this controversy, it was employed in this controversy first as a polemical weapon."

We must, however, leave this question of the *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed. Nor can we give more than a paragraph to Mr. Ffoulkes' account of his discoveries in reference to the false donation and false decretals. We have already intimated our astonishment that Mr. Ffoulkes should have had to wait till his life is waning into the sere leaf, and till he has given twenty years of study to ecclesiastical history, before he has become master of fundamental facts in ecclesiastical history, which, out of Oxford, would have been laid down in view of all Protestant students of the subject as elementary stepping stones in their progress, always to be kept in sight. We have referred to Fleury and Dupin, we might have added generally the French Benedictines; we have not named Fabricius or the Magdeburgh Centuriators, or Muratori, although to a learned student like Mr. Ffoulkes these should have been proximate authorities; we have referred to Mosheim, in whose texts and notes, with the additions of his commentators, may be found much lore on these points; we shall content ourselves here with citing the following passage from Campbell's *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*:—

“What but this favourite maxim can account for the many falsehoods and forgeries to which she so often recurred in support of her exorbitant claims? The ignorance and superstition of the dark ages that ensued (for those I have had occasion to refer to in this, and my two preceding lectures, are but as the evening twilight compared with those which followed) soon gave scope for attempting the very grossest kinds of imposition, and the friends and patrons of the hierarchy were not remiss in using the opportunity while it lasted. The fruits of their diligence, in this way, were fictitious councils as well as canons, and fictitious decrees of real councils, false deeds of gift, such as the instrument of donation of Rome and all Italy, made, as was pretended, by the Emperor Constantine to Pope Sylvester, and his successors in the Popedom; the decretal epistles of the Popes, not to mention the little legerdemain tricks of false miracles, and other such like artifices. For the lying spirit which had gotten possession of the head, quickly diffused itself throughout the members, and every petty priest supported his particular credit among the people by the same arts, exhibited, as it were, in miniature, which were on a larger scale displayed by the pontiff for the support of the great hierarchical empire. It must be owned the greater part of their forgeries, especially Constantine's donation and the decretal epistles, are such barefaced impostures, and so bunglingly executed, that nothing less than the most profound darkness of those ages could account for their success. They are manifestly written in the barbarous dialect which obtained in the eighth and ninth centuries, and exhibit those poor, meek, and humble teachers who came

immediately after the Apostles, as blustering, swaggering, and dictating to the world in the authoritative tone of a Zachary or a Stephen."—*Campbell's Works*, Tegg's Edition, vol. v., pp. 268-9.

Mr. Ffoulkes has much to say about all the points we have noted; he has much to say respecting the traditional policy of the Court of Rome, especially in regard to the Greek Church, and respecting its usurped prerogatives; severe things he says respecting the general character of the Romish policy and of the Popes themselves, and the habit and wont, in a sense the necessity, of falsehood and tyranny, which had come to press upon them, so as to expose the Papacy long ago to the cutting rebukes of Bernard, and, since his time, of more than a few high Catholic authorities; as to the Crusades also, and their purpose and character, Mr. Ffoulkes has much evidence to offer, and strong thoughts to utter; nearly the whole of this part of his pamphlet being, in fact, a summary of much that is contained in *Christendom's Divisions, Part II.* All that we, however, can do, as regards these points, is to quote Mr. Ffoulkes' own epitome of his conclusions, as it is given near the end of his pamphlet—

"I admit that up to the time of my inquiring into the true causes of the earlier schism between the East and West, I was not prepared to look upon the position of the Church of England as favourably as I do now; because I regarded it as the effect of schism—wilful and deliberate schism—on her part in separating from the Communion to which she has been so long bound, and over which, with the full concurrence of her clergy and laity for ages, Rome ruled supreme. I expressed this unhesitatingly three years back in the first part of my book,\* and am far from intending to retract *all* that I said then: but having since discovered the general system of Church government in which England, in common with all other Western nations, had up to that time acquiesced, to have been based upon forgeries, and opposed to the genuine code of the Church, I as unhesitatingly recognise the right—nay, the duty paramount—of every local Church to revolt against such a concatenation of spurious legislation as this, and scattering to the winds every link of the false chain that had enthralled it hitherto, to return to the letter and spirit of those genuine canons, stamped with the assent of the whole Church, and never repealed. Supposing this done, even the act of St. Augustine and his companions in establishing the jurisdiction of the patriarch of the West over this island is found illegal, having been declared null and void by anticipation in the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus already quoted. 'So that none of the bishops most beloved by God do assume any other province that is not, or was not formerly

---

\* *Christendom's Divisions.*



and from the beginning, subject to him, or those who were his predecessors. . . . But if any one introduces a regulation contrary to the present determination, the Holy General Synod decrees that it be of no force.' It is idle, or worse than idle, to assert that St. Augustine found England subject to Rome when he arrived: and it is quite true that he accomplished its subjection two centuries and a half or more previously to the publication of the pseudo-decretals; but it is no less true that its subjection was accomplished in the teeth of this canon, as well as of the protest of the native episcopate that he found in possession. It may well be doubted whether St. Gregory was ever properly made acquainted with their prescriptive claims; in any case what was then effected with his sanction was precisely what St. Leo the Great informed the East the canons would not allow of his conceding to the Constantinopolitan patriarch Anatolius at the fourth Council. The wily forger of the pseudo-decretals had his eye upon all such 'accomplished facts' in the West when he compiled his code, and either founded his maxims upon them or else sought to legitimatise them by the high authority which he claimed for his maxims. Both, therefore, necessarily belong to the same category: neither can one possibly stand without the other. Anglican divines have long cited this ordinance of the Council of Ephesus in proof of their canonical independence of the jurisdiction of Rome; but they ought in fairness to have acknowledged themselves at the same time bound by the Sardican canons, that British bishops assisted in passing, admitting and regulating appeals to the Pope. This, I conceive, will be found to be the true limit of what is due to the Pope from England, according to the genuine law of the Church. The primatial See of England, whether at Caerleon or elsewhere, was originally independent and autocephalous, and never should have been made amenable to his jurisdiction as patriarch, whether for consecration or any similar purpose.

"I am well aware, my Lord, that this last inference of mine must cut at the very root of your position in England, should it prove correct: but as I have lived in the investigation of these questions for the last twenty years and upwards, you will scarce accuse me of being influenced by personal considerations in getting to their final solution.

"I mean neither disrespect nor disaffection to the living authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, when I draw attention to the undeniable fact that they are daily violating the law of the Church. What I criticise has been the work of centuries, commenced ages since, and what all of them together, were they ever so righteously minded, could not possibly change all at once, still less make perfection. Again, what I criticise is not the faith of the Popes, but their governmental policy, and that only since they became temporal princes as well as bishops, and not before. Their court and see having been all one for practical purposes since the establishment of the former, it would be vain to attempt drawing the line between them, especially

as it is their joint action upon the Church, not upon empires or men in general, to which the verdict of history is most adverse. I am well aware, and have frequently spoken, of the services rendered by Rome to the nations of Europe, morally, socially, and religiously, in promoting their civilisation, in many respects a most up-hill task; and for these I am inclined to think there are some arrears of gratitude still due to it from Europe, and perhaps never likely to be settled, though I suppose none benefited more largely by their achievements in the middle ages than the Popes themselves. But when I contemplate the divisions of Christendom, past and present, and search history for their origin, I find it is the conduct of the Popes, more than anything else, for the last thousand years, in governing the Church, which has divided the Church. First of all, they allowed crowned heads to tamper with the Creed of the Church, if not to the unsettling of her faith, at least to the dividing of her household. Secondly, they allowed a spurious code to be brought into gradual use, without troubling themselves to refer to their own archives for proofs of its origin, and ultimately to overlay and be taken for the genuine laws of the Church. Thirdly, they countenanced one part of the Church, then in a minority, making war upon, and taking possession of, not merely the temporalities, but the ecclesiastical revenues and sees of the other part of the Church, then in a majority, to the ruin of Christianity, and triumphing of the Crescent over the Cross in those parts eventually whence the Gospel had first sped. They countenanced all this because it brought gain and aggrandisement to themselves and to their see, conformably with the maxims of the false, but in opposition to the maxims of the true code. Fourthly, as I have proved elsewhere, they put off reforming the Church in their own patriarchate by fair means, till Providence permitted that it should be done by foul. Such is the verdict of history upon their conduct as Church governors since they became princes."—Pp. 59-62.

On all these points, however, Mr. Ffoulkes, as the Archbishop in effect told him, has but published in the year 1869, for the benefit of pamphlet and newspaper readers, what has, for generations past, been known to all Protestant students of ecclesiastical history, and to most well-informed Roman Catholic students, at least in Germany and France. The most remarkable part of his pamphlet consists of the results of his personal observations as an honest and liberal Romanist, and *quondam* Anglo-Catholic, in the two spheres, the Anglican and the Romanist, with which he has been familiar.

"Where, indeed," says Mr. Ffoulkes, "is the part of Christendom seriously purporting to call itself the Catholic Church in these days? Roman Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, Episcopal, Orthodox, or Presbyterian, all in their degree seem influenced by some hidden spell to abstain from

arrogating to themselves or attributing to each other the epithet of 'Catholic' without qualification, as it is applied to the Church in the Creed. Test existing phenomena by this theory, and the results are plain and straightforward. One of its logical results would be that the administration of the Christian Sacraments might be frequented with profit outside the pale of the Roman Communion. Is this confirmed by experience? My Lord, my own experience, which is confined to the single Communion in which you formerly bore office, that of the Church of England, says emphatically that it is: and there is no canon or ordinance that I know of forbidding me to maintain it. You have preceded me yourself in expatiating on the workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England with your accustomed eloquence, and have not hesitated to attribute to its members many graces in virtue of the Sacrament of Baptism which you allow they administer on the whole validly: but there you stop. I feel morally constrained to go further still. If I had to die for it, I could not possibly subscribe to the idea that the Sacraments to which I am admitted week after week in the Roman Communion—Confession and the Holy Eucharist, for instance—confer any graces, any privileges, essentially different from what I used to derive from those same Sacraments, frequented with the same dispositions, in the Church of England. On the contrary, I go so far as to say, that comparing one with another strictly, some of the most edifying communions that I can remember in all my life were made in the Church of England, and administered to me by some that have since submitted to be re-ordained in the Church of Rome; a ceremony, therefore, which, except as qualifying them to undertake duty there, I must consider superfluous. Assuredly, so far as the registers of my own spiritual life carry me, I have not been able to discover any greater preservatives from sin, any greater incentives to holiness, in any that I have received since; though, in saying this, I am far from intending any derogation to the latter. I frequent them regularly: I prize them exceedingly; I have no fault to find with their administration or their administrators in general. All that I was ever taught to expect from them they do for me, due allowance being made for my own shortcomings. Only I cannot possibly subscribe to the notion of my having been a stranger to their beneficial effects till I joined the Roman Communion, and I deny that it was my faith alone that made them what they were to me before then, unless it is through my faith alone that they are what they are to me now. Holding myself that there are realities attaching to the Sacraments of an objective character, I am persuaded, and have been more and more confirmed in this conviction as I have grown older, that the Sacraments administered in the Church of England are realities, objective realities, to the same extent as any that I could now receive at your hands; so that you yourself therefore consecrated the Eucharist as truly when you were Vicar of Lavington as you have ever done since. This may or may not be your own belief; but you shall be one of my foremost witnesses to its credibility, for I am far from basing it on the experiences of my own soul. My Lord, I

have always been accustomed to look upon the Sacraments as so many means of grace, and to estimate their value, not by the statements of theologians, but by their effects on myself, my neighbours, and mankind at large. And the vast difference between the moral tone of society in the Christian and the pagan worlds I attribute not merely to the superiority of the rule of life prescribed in the Gospels, but to the inherent grace of the Sacraments enabling and assisting us to keep it to the extent we do. Taking this principle for my guide, I have been engaged constantly since I joined the Roman Communion in instituting comparisons between members of the Church of England and members of the Church of Rome generally, and between our former and our present selves in particular; or between Christianity in England and on the Continent; and the result in each case has been to confirm me in the belief which I have expressed already, that the notion of the Sacraments exercising any greater influence upon the heart and life in the Church of Rome than in the Church of England, admitting the dispositions of those who frequent them to be the same in both cases, is not merely preposterous, but as contrary both to faith and fact as is the opinion that the Pope is Antichrist and the Man of Sin. My Lord, there is no person in his sober senses who could affirm that you, for instance, began to be a devout, earnest, intelligent follower of Christ, an admirable master of the inner and the hidden life, a glorious example of self-sacrifice, a deep expounder of revealed mysteries and Gospel truths, when you embraced the Roman Communion; or that all those graces which you exhibited previously in the sight of men could be deduced from the one rite which you received unconsciously as a child, counteracted by all the bad and unwholesome food on which, according to this hypothesis, you must have lived ever afterwards. In the same way there is no ordinary person in his sober senses who could affect to discover any fundamental change for the better in you, morally or religiously, now from what you were then. There are some, on the contrary, to my knowledge, of your existing flock who profess that they have not half the liking for the sermons which they hear you deliver as Archbishop of Westminster that they have for the dear old volumes which you published as Archdeacon of Chichester, as fresh and full of fragrance to their instincts as ever. And I have heard the same said of another, whose parochial sermons, hailed as a masterpiece on their first appearance, have just burst forth into a second spring. People say that sermons which *ci-devant* Anglican clergymen of note preached formerly read so much more natural than any that they have since delivered from Roman Catholic pulpits. They argued impartially, then, as men whose sole desire it was both to get at the truth, and uphold it at any cost; they never feared looking facts in the face, and were as little given to exaggerate those that made for them, as to keep out of sight or evade by subterfuge those which they could neither excuse nor explain. They were never tired of confessing their own sins or shortcomings. In a word, their tone was frank, honest, and manly. Now, they may preach with the same

energy, but it is as though they preached under constraint or dictation. Either they are high-flown and exaggerated: or else punctilious and reserved: weighing each word as if they were repeating a task: always artificial, never themselves: as if committed to a thesis, which they must defend at all risks, and to which all facts must be accommodated, or else denied. Hence, do what they will, there is a distinction between themselves and the cause they advocate, which cannot fail to strike the most ordinary listener: their words no longer carry the moral argument (*ἡθικὴ πίστις*) with them that they once did even among their followers: and the judgment of public opinion on them is that they are vapid and destitute of force by comparison. What people say of those generally who have become Roman Catholics in England of late years, is that they have deteriorated as a body rather than advanced. The foremost of them have not progressed in any perceptible degree—perceptible by others, that is—beyond the high standard to which they had attained before, as their lives, their writings, and their sermons testified: others, every allowance being made for the peculiar trials to which they have been subjected, have notoriously descended to a lower level of Christianity since they became Roman Catholics, from that in which they had been working previously; and some have been driven from their moorings—in appearance at least—altogether. All this I hear said: and as far as my own experience goes, it is quite true: and for the life of me I cannot infer anything else from it than that sacramental grace is equally derivable from the same ordinances in both Communions, according to the dispositions of those who frequent them, and is not more indefatigable in the one than the other. What I have seen of Roman Catholics myself, since joining their Church, all points to the same conclusion. Till then, I knew them only by report, which, founded on prejudice, was far from being in their favour: and I was horrified to find how shamefully it had misrepresented them. I found them—I mean the educated classes—all that in a general estimate members of a Christian Church should be: God-serving, charitable, conscientious, refined, intelligent: and I could discover nothing idolatrous or superstitious in their worship, nor anything at variance with first principles in their daily life. At home or abroad I was equally surprised to find them so different from what my traditional informants had described them, with so much to admire where I had supposed there was so much to reprobate. But afterwards—when my first emotions consequent on this discovery had subsided—when I came to ask myself the question, are these, then, the only true Christians that you have ever known in life; and till you conversed with them, had you never conversed with a true Christian before? I can scarce describe the recoil that it occasioned in me. Why, my own father and mother would have compared with the best of them in all the virtues ordinarily possessed by Christians living in the world and discharging their duties conscientiously towards God and their neighbours, in, through, and for Christ. ‘All for Jesus’ was as much their motto as it could be of any parents

in Christendom : and well—indeed would it be for all Roman Catholic children if they were blessed with no worse fathers and mothers than mine. Then I have, or have had, relatives and friends in numbers, members of the Church of England, whose homes I will undertake to say are to all intents and purposes as thoroughly Christian as any to be found elsewhere : and it would be sheer affectation or hypocrisy in me were I to pretend the contrary : or else to claim for my own friends and relatives any peculiar excellence distinguishing them from average specimens of the Anglican body. For a calm, unassuming, uniform standard of practical Christianity, I have seen nothing as yet amongst ourselves in any country superior to that of the English parsonage and its surroundings : go where I will, I am always thrown back upon one of these as the most perfect ideal of a Christian family : a combination amongst its members of the highest intelligence with the most unsullied purity and earnest faith I ever witnessed on earth. It was a privilege to have witnessed it. It was not far from Brackley. You may have known several such yourself. On describing the 'daily round' of Christian life in the English Church—such as I have been accustomed to from a child—to the excellent priest who received me into communion on the Continent—our family prayers, our grace before and after meals, our readings of the Scriptures, our observance of Sunday, our services at Church, our Sunday-schools—what did he do but mount his pulpit the Sunday following, and embodying all that I had told him in a fervid discourse, expatiate to a fashionable congregation in Paris on the many lessons of piety which they had to learn from their separated brethren on the other side of the Channel? 'Such, too, was our general practice,' he said to me in a private conversation, 'before the Revolution : and we hope to recover it : but as yet there are few families where it exists.' Of my countrymen he observed, '*Leur bonne foi est acceptée pour leur vraie foi.*' I took this explanation in trust at the time, but have since given it up as inadequate. For if it be said that faith and integrity of purpose make members of the Church of England what they are without the Sacraments in mature life, by what argument, I should like to know, can it be proved that it is not to their faith and integrity of purpose solely that members of the Roman Catholic Church are indebted likewise for all the progress they make? The only test of the efficaciousness of the Sacraments appreciable by common sense lies in their influence upon conduct. If therefore it were capable of proof, as distinct from assertion, which it is not, both that all the Sacraments administered in the Church of England but one were shams, and all administered in the Church of Rome, without exception, realities, how comes it that we are not incomparably more exalted characters ourselves than we were formerly : or that Roman Catholic countries on the Continent are not incomparably more penetrated to the core with Christianity than England? Both these points, I dare say, might be affirmed by some : but they are denied, and I maintain with much more reason, by others, and therefore at best it can only be the degree



to which the thing exists, not whether it exists at all, which is in question. I have already spoken of the eloquent sermon I heard preached in Paris, in which the Christian practices of my old friends in England were held up for imitation. The preacher himself had a history of his own hardly less eloquent. He had quitted the cure of one of the most important churches in Paris to found a religious community for the purpose of raising the tone of the French clergy. What had impelled him? Simply, the extremely devout demeanour of two *ci-devant* Anglican clergymen lately become Oratorians, whom he had watched saying their masses at one of the altars in his own church from his confessional. Certainly they could not have said a Roman Mass before they became Roman Catholic priests; but for all their preliminary training in piety they were beholden as certainly to the Communion which they had just quitted: so that they who had been educated in Anglicanism were the means of suggesting to a Roman Catholic priest in France how much room there was for improvement in the training of his fellow-clergy."—Pp. 45–51.

Now, this is plain common-sense, practical English common-sense. But then its scope extends much farther than Mr. Ffoulkes, whose powers of logical anticipation appear to be by no means subtle or swift, would seem to have any idea. There are Christian communities which esteem it to be their advantage and safety that they have no "hierarchy," no "Apostolical succession." These, therefore, according to Mr. Ffoulkes, have no sacramental grace, except that imparted in baptism, lay-baptism being valid. Does Mr. Ffoulkes imagine that in these communities there is and has been less of Christian principle and influence than in the Anglican or the Roman Catholic Church? Let him think of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the Continent during the last three centuries, of the Presbyterians of Scotland, Ireland, and England, of the English Nonconformists of the last two centuries, of the Methodists; let him give but a glance at the Anglo-Saxon American Christians, among whom the hierarchical Episcopalians constitute but the most insignificant fraction; and let him consider whether his argument must not, of necessity and in common decency, be so extended as to include within the sweep of its comfortable conclusions the great body of non-Episcopalian Christian Churches. If he should need quickening on his way to accept an extension which, however opposed to his favourite postulate, to the fundamental error which has led him into all his ecclesiastical perplexities, is yet fatally inevitable, we can administer the needful stimulus to his movement, by a quotation from Dr. Manning, the authority of which, on such a point, Mr. Ffoulkes will not be able to deny. The words which we are

about to cite occur, indeed, in the very passage of the Archbishop's letter to Dr. Pusey, to which Mr. Ffoulkes refers with approbation in the forty-fifth page of his pamphlet—

"It must not, however, be forgotten, for a moment, that this applies to the whole English people, of all forms of Christianity, or, as it is called, 'of all denominations.' What I have said does not recognise the grace of the Church of England as such. The working of grace in the Church of England is a truth we joyfully hold and always teach. But we as joyfully recognise the working of the Holy Spirit among Dissenters of every kind. Indeed, I must say, that I am far more able to assure myself of the invincible ignorance of Dissenters as a mass than of Anglicans as a mass. They are far more deprived of what survived of Catholic truth; far more distant from the idea of a Church; far more traditionally opposed to it by the prejudice of education; I must add, for the most part, far more simple in their belief in the person and passion of our Divine Lord. Their piety is more like the personal service of disciples to a personal Master than the Anglican piety, which has always been more dim and distant from this central light of souls. Witness Jeremy Taylor's works, as much I have loved them, compared with Baxter's, or even those of Andrewes compared with Leighton's, who was formed by the Kirk of Scotland.

"I do not here forget all you have done to provide ascetical and devotional books for the use of the Church of England, both by your own writings, and, may I not say it, from your neighbour's vineyard?

"With truth, then, I can say, that I rejoice in all the operations of the Holy Spirit out of the Catholic Church, whether in the Anglican or other Protestant bodies; not that those communions are thereby invested with any supernatural character, but because more souls, I trust, are saved. If I have a greater joy over these workings of grace in the Church of England, it is only because more who are dear to me are in it, for whom I never fail to pray day by day. These graces to individuals were given before the Church was founded, and are given still out of its unity. They are no more tokens of an ecclesiastical character, or a sacramental power in the Church of England, than in the Kirk of Scotland, or in the Wesleyan Connexion; they prove only the manifold grace of God, which, after all the sins of men, and in the midst of all the ruins they have made, still works in the souls for whom Christ died. Such, then, is our estimate of the Church of England in regard to the grace that works not *by* it, nor *through* it, but *in* it, and among those who, without faults of their own, are detained by it from the true Church of their baptism.

"Moreover, to be just, I must say, that if the Church of England be a barrier against infidelity, the Dissenters must also be admitted to a share in this office, and in the praise due to it. And in truth, I do not know among the Dissenters any works like the 'Essays and Reviews,' or any Biblical criticism like that of Dr. Colenso. They may not be very dogmatic in their teaching; but they bear their

witness for Christianity as a Divine revelation, for the Scriptures as an inspired book, and, I must add further, for the personal Christianity of conversion and repentance, with an explicitness and consistency which is not less effectual against infidelity than the testimony of the Church of England. I do not think the Wesleyan Conference, or the authorities of the Three Denominations, would accept readily this assumed superiority of the Anglican Church as a witness against unbelief. They would point, and not unjustly, to the doctrinal confusions of the Church of England as causes of scepticism, from which they are comparatively free. And I am bound to say that I think they would have an advantage. I well remember that while I was in the Church of England I used to regard Dissenters from it with a certain, I will not say aversion, but distance and recoil. I never remember to have borne animosity against them, or to have attacked or pursued them with unkindness. I always believed many of them to be very earnest and devoted men. I did not like their theology, and I believed them to be in disobedience to the Church of England; but I respected them, and lived at peace with them. Indeed, I may say, that some of the best people I have ever known out of the Church were Dissenters or children of Dissenters. Nevertheless, I had a dislike of their system, and of their meeting-houses. They seemed to me to be rivals of the Church of England, and my loyalty to it made me look somewhat impatiently upon them. But I remember, from the hour I submitted to the Catholic Church, all this underwent a sensible change. I saw that the whole revelation was perpetuated in the Church alone, and that all forms of Christianity lying round about it were but fragments more or less mutilated. But with this a sensible increase of kindly feeling grew upon me. The Church of England and the Dissenting communions all alike appeared to me to be upon the same level. I rejoiced in all the truth that remains in them, in all the good I could see or hope for in them, and all the workings of the Holy Spirit in them. I had no temptation to animosity towards them; for neither they nor the Church of England could be rivals of the imperishable and immutable Church of God. The only sense, then, in which I could regard the Church of England as a barrier against infidelity, I must extend also to the Dissenting bodies, and I cannot put this high, for reasons I will give."—*England and Christendom*, pp. 102-3, 116-9.

From all this it must follow, on Mr. Ffoulkes' own principles, that sacramental grace comes as really and as fully to Christians who have never been brought into contact with the priests of any "Catholic" hierarchy as to "Catholic" Christians, so called, whether Roman or Anglican. Practically, administratively, in effect, the "Catholic" hierarchist substitutes the priest and the sacrament for the Spirit and the Truth. "Faith cometh by hearing, hearing by the Word of God." Christians can only "purify their heart unto un-

feigned love of the brethren in obeying the truth through the Spirit." The truth, indeed, speaks through the sacramental symbol, and the Spirit's power and blessing received into the believing soul fulfils the Divine pledge of the sacramental seal. But whether it be by the spoken Word, or by the Word in the Sacrament, it is ever true that Christians are "sanctified through the Truth," and that God's "Word is Truth." And so it must ever be "until we all come," even the whole Church of Christ, "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Mr. Ffoulkes cannot really make good his escape from the perplexities which beset him, nor defend his "contumacy" in standing where he does, unless he will abandon the principles of necessary external unity, continuity, and authority, and embrace instead the principles of free spiritual Christianity, the doctrines of immediate personal union with Christ, and of the invisible and spiritual unity and fellowship in Christ of all true believers, who alone constitute collectively the true Church, "the body of Christ," "the fulness of Him which filleth all in all." The doctrines of hierarchical prerogative and of specific sacramental virtue must be abandoned, or he must be content to make his unconditional submission to Ultramontane Catholicism.

We resume our question from Mr. Ffoulkes at the place where he brings us within view, from an interior point, of the varieties of Christianity, or of nominally Christian superstition, which are contained within the Roman pale. The glimpse we catch is very interesting:—

"I have another anecdote to tell of the same kind from what happened to me when in Spain much more recently. I spent the latter part of Lent, including Holy Week, at Seville: and had looked forward to the ceremonies immediately preceding Easter there with no small interest. But when the time for them arrived, I never saw services more coldly conducted or more scantily attended, and ceremonies less productive, in appearance at least, of any devotional feelings. I returned from them each time pained and scandalised. About the middle of Holy Week I fortunately had occasion to go to my banker's; and on entering I found a priest there waiting like myself to be served. Something induced me to accost him in English; on his replying to me in the same, we soon entered warmly into conversation. He turned out to be a young priest who had 'served his time' at the Brompton Oratory, though not a native of England. I confided to him what I thought of the services. He expressed no surprise: on the contrary, he dissuaded me from going again to the churches I named. 'Come to our church,' he said, 'and I think you will see things done as they

ought to be, and a very different style of congregation.' I went, and found it all as he had told me. There was life in the services, earnestness in the celebrants, devotion in the worshippers. The Brompton Oratory, that heart-stirring creation of old Oxford and Cambridge men, had sent out missionaries to evangelise Seville. Nobody who had frequented and compared it with the churches all round could dispute its claim to be the beginning of a new order of things here. As I am in Spain already, I may as well go on. From Seville I proceeded to a small village in the neighbourhood of the Sierra of most primitive description. There I remained several months. There was early Mass most mornings of the week: but I seldom, if ever, saw any but women at it: and these rarely more than from ten to twenty. But on Sundays at High Mass, the church, which was of considerable size for a village church, was crammed full of men and women, the former thronging the choir as far as it would contain them, where I sat myself. I took some pains to examine, but I never could discover anybody, man, woman or child, in the whole congregation who used a book besides myself: and whatever may have been their inmost feelings, which I do not pretend to decipher, the countenances of the men bespoke nothing but listless apathy. Vespers were invariably attended by the priest, one cantor, and myself: in all, three, and to the best of my remembrance, never more. There were no evening services of any description while I was there. The only spark of devotion I ever witnessed—and I record it with as much pleasure—was that now and then I used to see parties of four or five women sitting outside their doors in the cool of the evening reciting their chaplet. The priest was affable and intelligent: and seemed anxious to promote education; but he was a good deal mixed up in the secular affairs of his neighbours as well: and the honours of his house were always done by one who went by the name of his 'cugina' [*cousin*], but I was laughed at for supposing it meant the relationship that we understand by it. I could only therefore account for the average respect that was paid him on the supposition that such things were not uncommon. Altogether, I quitted this village feeling strongly that there was certainly not more real Christianity practised in it than in my own native parish in Wales, if so much: that the Welsh there were better educated and more intelligent in their devotions beyond comparison than these specimens of Andalusia, and that the clergyman there could not at all events have a woman sitting at the head of his table who was neither his wife nor his relation. Yet this was a country that had remained exclusively Roman Catholic since its release from the Moors. From the south of Spain I proceed to the garden of France, the heart of Tourraine. There I passed some time pleasantly enough at a country house, long before I joined the Roman Catholic Church: yet I studied its workings then with no less interest. As there was no Anglican Church within reach, I accompanied the family to the parish church, from two to three miles off, just about the distance of my own at home. Church-going was confined to Mass on Sundays, high or low: Low when any of the family communicated, which was never oftener than once a month; High Mass otherwise.

This was the only public service to which anybody, speaking generally, went in the neighbourhood: and that over, everybody met, gossiped, and promenaded up and down the village till the carriages were ready to take them home. This was precisely the custom of my own neighbourhood: but with this difference, that most of the gentry came to church twice on Sundays, and some of them likewise to occasional services during the week in Lent, Advent, or Christmas-time. There was one circumstance connected with my Sundays in France, there or elsewhere, which I shall not easily forget. I was always asked to the best parties, and to the best hunting or shooting, on Sundays: and being a keen sportsman in those days, it was no small act of self-denial, in obedience to my Anglican principles, to forego the latter. Well! the finest 'battue' to which I ever had a chance of going was at an historic château not far from where I was staying at Tourraine, where, by the way, the church stood just outside the grounds, and the lady of the château, to her credit be it spoken, attended Mass daily: the usual congregation, however, being herself and the acolyte, besides the priest. As this battue was on Sunday, I declined it equally, and went to church. Immediately before the Gospel—just in time to save Mass, that is—a bustle was heard outside the building which made the congregation look up: and presently the principal actors in the 'chasse' entered, leaving their guns, dogs, and game with their retainers in the porch, and were thus corporally present. With the last Gospel they had disappeared to resume their sport. I thought then, and still think, that so far we did things in reality better in England a hundredfold, notwithstanding that appearances were kept up there."

We must find room for quoting a part of Mr. Ffoulkes' conclusions.

"To come to my conclusions. The conviction impressed upon me by what I have heard and seen at home and abroad is that English Christianity—by which I mean that of members of the Church of England in general, I cannot speak from experience of any other—is as good and genuine, and for ordinary purposes as beneficial, as what is found in other nations—France, Spain, and Italy, for instance—so that either it is produced, fed, and nourished by all the Sacraments, as theirs is: or else, produced, fed, and nourished, by a single Sacrament, it penetrates society and forms character to the same extent as that which has the support of all the Sacraments, and is no less efficacious for good in most other respects; it may be isolated, but such is the position of England politically as well as geographically: its peculiarities are of a piece with the national character, itself having its weak as well as its strong side: its shortcomings, historically traceable to the sins of our forefathers in no small degree. Among the strong points attributable to its influences are a strong love of honesty in intention, of truthfulness in language, and of uprightness and manliness in conduct: and a still stronger abhorrence of falsehood and treachery to engagements in every form. Its virtues belong mostly to the practical and domestic



order. Its weak points are too great self-reliance, too much disposition to criticise, too little faith in the Unseen. As a general rule, Roman Catholics are weak where Anglicans are strongest, and strong where Anglicans fail. Such results are due to the system in each case, showing imperfections in each. Anglicans may be compared with Roman Catholics in this country, as boys brought up at a public school in England with boys brought up at a private school or else at home. Anglicans may be compared with Roman Catholics abroad as men educated at Oxford or Cambridge with men educated at the Universities of Paris, Munich, or Padua. Fundamentally, their faith and practice is the same: but they have been formed after different models in both. I trust the day is not far distant when the religiously minded in both Communions will insist on associating together as brethren, and learning from each other as Christians, and combining for works of charity without distinction of nations. Too long—much too long—have they been kept in ignorance of each other, and thus prevented improving each other, through prejudice. The two points on which alone I notice any sensible difference between my own devotional practices in former days and now, are praying for the souls of the departed and invoking the saints in glory. Both practices I can unhesitatingly pronounce from experience to be full of comfort and profit, of elevating and purifying influences: I am sorry for those who live in ignorance or neglect of them: and can hardly imagine any person who has tried them in a spirit of faith honestly abandoning them. Still every fresh page I read of Church history in the 14th and 15th centuries convinces me more and more of the awful profanity that had attached to both in those days; and as even in the Roman Catholic manuals of devotion I use myself there are frequent hyperboles of language that I could never adopt, and should desire to see cancelled above all things, I cannot consider the excessive caution of the Church of England altogether directed against a thing of the past, and without excuse now. Words employed in non-natural senses are dangerous stumbling-blocks in any Communion. Our own liturgical offices were carefully weeded at the time of the Council of Trent, and contain no such extravagances. It would be well if we were never on any pretext allowed to exceed their measured language in our private forms. Neither our liturgical forms, indeed, as they now exist, any more than our private forms, embodying such devotions, were known to the primitive Church: and therefore the lack of them in the Church of England, however much to be regretted on all accounts, cannot affect the essence, though it may impair the tenderness, of the Christianity taught and imbibed there. I am therefore satisfied that the Christianity taught and imbibed there differs in no fundamental quality from that with which I have been conversant since joining the Roman Communion. I am morally certain that I have frequented the same Sacraments in both with profit: consequently I feel that I could die equally well in the one or the other: and can see no reason for changing from one to the other except on *secondary* grounds, or unless driven to it. 'When they persecute you in this city'—of *Israel*, that

is—"flee ye into another," was not said for the Apostles alone. In conclusion, it is my firm persuasion still—indeed much more so than in 1853, when I published my first book—that should Christendom ever be reunited, it will go down to posterity as having been brought about mainly by those who had been born and educated in the Church of England.

"With these convictions, it may seem superfluous in me to add my belief that having been ordained priest in the Church of England, I am a priest still. . . . On jurisdiction, I need not reiterate what I have said already, or am about to say. 'Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist?' is his chief difficulty. 'Could I, without distressing or offending an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they—the Anglican clergy—have been and are to their Eucharist?' My Lord, it is anything but my intention to excuse or extenuate the scandalous irreverence that prevailed shortly before our own days, and I fear is not extinct yet, amongst Anglican clergymen in administering the Sacraments of the Church: but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that it followed naturally from their low views of them, and that their low views of them were precipitated by the audacity that centuries ago was not afraid to say of the Eucharist, '*Sacerdos creat Deum*;' of penance, '*Deus remittit culpam: Papa vero culpam et penam*,' and the like. But taking our own views of the Blessed Eucharist into account, is there or has there been any tale of irreverence towards it amongst Anglicans, comparable for horrors with the history of poisoned chalices and poisoned Hosts amongst ourselves formerly, the extent of which is made patent to this day by the special precautions taken whenever the Pope celebrates mass most solemnly, that no such harm may befall him—'Avant qu'il arrive'—I am quoting from a well-known précis of the ceremonies of Easter in Rome—'on a coutume de faire l'épreuve des espèces de la manière suivante: le Diacre prend une des trois hosties qu'il a mises en ligne droit sur la patène, et la rend au Prélat-Sacriste. Quand celui-ci l'a reçue, le Cardinal-diacre prend de nouveau l'une des deux qui reste: et après l'avoir fait toucher intérieurement et extérieurement au calice et à la patène, il la consigne au Prélat-Sacriste, qui doit la consommer aussitôt, ainsi que la première, le visage tourné vers le Pape. La troisième et dernière hostie est employée pour le sacrifice. Le Cardinal prend les burettes du vin et de l'eau, en verse un peu dans la coupe, que lui présente le Prélat-Sacriste, dont ce dernier doit boire immédiatement le contenu.'

"Such perversion of the life-giving Sacrament to destroy life, as had to be specially guarded against in this way whenever the Vicar of Christ pontificated, is absolutely without parallel in the annals of the Anglican Church since the Reformation. So that, notwithstanding our high views of it, the worst known profanations of it have been amongst ourselves."—Pp. 55-59.

On the whole, we find Mr. Ffoulkes' writings conducive to charity. After reading them, we think better of Romanists, of Anglo-Catholics, and of the prospects of Christendom. We are, indeed, astonished anew, and more than ever, at the

puerility which clings inseparably to the hierarchical system, and all its adherents; and at the self-confident isolation of thought and inquiry which is so peculiarly and remarkably characteristic of University men. For them, to master the books which they happen to have heard of, or which they can find in certain libraries, with which they happen to be connected, is fully enough. It appears scarcely to occur to them to make inquiry in the general world; to ask what may have been written by non-University men, or by non-Catholics, by Gallican authorities, or Lutheran authorities, or Reformed authorities, by Scotch Presbyterians, or American scholars, or English Nonconformists. Hence, multitudes of them live and die, walking in a vain shadow, and disquieting themselves in vain, ignorant of all that has been done or written, beyond the limits of their set, their university, or their ecclesiastical brigade. The errors, the defeats, the absurdities into which this exclusiveness—the fault of English society transferred to English studentship—has betrayed many English Churchmen, are innumerable. Meantime, we cannot but have the best hopes that an honest, candid, painstaking man like Mr. Ffoulkes will yet emancipate himself from the bonds and trammels of ecclesiastical prejudice and “Catholic” superstition.

---

ART. V.—*Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, A.D. 1598—1867: with a Preliminary Notice of the Earlier Library founded in the Fourteenth Century.* By the Rev. WILLIAM DUNN MACRAY, M.A. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1868.

FROM a recent calculation, which is necessarily approximate, it appears that there are at present in the Royal, National, and Collegiate Libraries of Europe and America, upwards of twenty millions of printed books, and about three-quarters of a million of manuscripts. This estimate does not include private libraries, or the collections of learned societies; many of which are of large extent and of priceless worth. The annual accumulation by means of purchases, bequests, and legal exaction, is measured by hundreds of thousands. This, of course, is in the department of printed books, mainly; for the rate of increase in the manuscript department is lessening year by year. The various storehouses of manuscript literature have been almost drained of their precious contents; and though up and down among Levantine monasteries and other hiding-places, there may yet lurk invaluable treasures of parchment lore, it is probable that future acquisitions from such quarters will not prove either numerous or very valuable.

Each of these libraries has a history, replete with interesting facts, and often bordering on romance. This, indeed, is true of single books and scrolls. What stories of patient toil, of ascetic solitude, of saintly devotion, of impassioned study, lie buried among those manuscript treasures which have survived by many centuries the hand that inscribed them. The imagination may revel untrammelled among those venerable palimpsests which were once, perhaps, the solace of the Athenian scholar or the Roman diplomatist, but which in after days were traced over with new characters by some zealous hand, purged of their heathen taint, and consecrated to saintly use. But in the great libraries there is no need for the play of the imagination. Each one of them has actual records, dating back, in some cases, to far-off centuries, and full of interest. Of the materials thus available very little use has hitherto been made. Brief and fragmentary sketches have been attempted, and some sections or departments have met with an annalist; but the work has been very inadequately done.

The immense area traversed by Mr. Edwards, in his *Memoirs of Libraries*, necessarily prevented him from prosecuting that detail which would be the charm of such a record as might be written. Annals of particular departments have only a limited interest. We therefore welcome Mr. Macray's volume on the Bodleian as an attempt, in some senses a very successful one, in the right direction. Naturally enough, he has been led to give special prominence to the department with which he is more directly concerned. An undue importance, as we think, has been attached to the official history of the Library—the names, dates, characteristics of successive librarians; space being thus occupied by details of indifferent value, which might have been given to questions of more general interest. The compiler's plan, too, is a little discursive. But he has, nevertheless, produced a book that, however incomplete, must be regarded as a very valuable contribution to a branch of literature of which, it is to be hoped, this is only the first-fruits.

The origin of libraries must be sought in the shadowy age where it is impossible to define the line which separates history from tradition. Rocca, the founder of the Angelican Library at Rome, avers that there were public libraries before the Deluge! Without adopting a date so remote as that assigned by the enthusiastic monk, we may safely conclude that libraries were instituted many centuries before the Christian era. M. Jules Oppert professes to have discovered among the Assyrian antiquities remains of a public library of clay tablets, prepared and collected by the order of Sardanapalus the Fifth, about the year 650 B.C., for purposes of public instruction. Mr. Layard bears witness to the general use among the Assyrians and Babylonians of tiles or cylinders of clay, on which impressions were traced and rendered permanent by submitting the clay to the action of fire. Among the tombs of Egypt there are inscriptions which point to the actual appropriation of plots of ground for public libraries. One of these, according to Mr. Osburne, carries us back to at least two centuries before the Christian era. Two other inscriptions, which belong probably to the same date, commemorate "the land devoted to the library of Sefphres."

The well-known paragraph in Diodorus Siculus, borrowed from the works of Hecataeus, gives us the first historical data as to the existence of libraries. The library of *Osymandyas*, to which he refers, with its memorable inscription, "The Dispensary of the Mind," has been identified with the *Memnonium*, or *Rameseum* of Thebes. Inscriptions sculptured in

the rooms of this celebrated temple clearly show that some portions of it were devoted to books and study. The date of this building is assigned to the fourteenth century before Christ. There are evident traces of the existence of libraries among the Hebrews, though few particulars have survived. On the somewhat dubious testimony of Anlus Gellius, a library was founded at Athens, about 537 B.C., by Pisistratus; but Strabo affirms that Aristotle was the first known collector of a library, and that he bequeathed his collection to Theophrastus, 322 B.C. Aristotle is said to have made the suggestion which ultimately led to the foundation of the library of Alexandria by Ptolemy Soter. The untrustworthiness of the information available concerning this library may be inferred from the fact that its contents are estimated at from one hundred thousand to seven hundred thousand volumes. The library of Pergamos, which became the rival of that of Alexandria, and which was transferred to Alexandria by Antony, after the fire which destroyed the grand collection of the Ptolemies, was founded by Attalus I., who flourished 241—197 B.C. Of these libraries, as well as those of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Constantinople, we know little beyond the fact of their destruction. There appear to have been some valuable public libraries at Rome. That of Lucullus, according to Plutarch, was of remarkable extent and beauty, and was open to all. Tradition assigns the founding of another to Asinius Pollio, or, preferably, to Julius Cæsar. This was enriched by successive emperors. Its ultimate fate, as well as that of many collections, both public and private, in Rome, is unknown.

The real germ of the great libraries of modern times lay, undoubtedly, in the monastic institutions of the middle ages. Whatever estimate may be entertained as to the influence of these institutions as a whole, no one can hesitate to admit their value to the cause of literature. Though literature was only incidentally the object of the monastic life, the patient toil of the transcriber being the fruit rather of his love of souls than his passion for letters; yet it is certain that but for the labours of the monks, we should have lost for ever, not only the works of the fathers and schoolmen, but the now imperishable treasures of classical literature, exhaustless sources of pleasure and inspiration. The monasteries of the Nitrian desert, founded probably by St. Ammon, are yet contributing to the libraries of Europe trophies of monastic toil dating back some fifteen hundred years. The Benedictine monasteries were all more or less distinguished by the splendour of their libraries; and one of the oldest foundations of their



Order, that of Monte Cassino, dating very early in the sixth century, still contains a collection which, though spoiled of some of its glories, is remarkably fine. The abbey of St. Gall, in Switzerland, claims for its library an antiquity of a thousand years. Scarcely less renowned were the labours of the Augustinian Orders; and notably those of the Order of St. Dominic, the strongest offshoot of Augustinianism. Later on the Franciscans and Carmelites—the latter, however, claiming a remote antiquity—distinguished themselves for their zealous labours in the cause of literature. The Carmelites had a valuable library at Oxford.

If tradition be of historical worth, the first library in England was founded by the monk Augustine. It consisted of nine precious volumes, which were deposited in the Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury. The work thus initiated was rapidly enriched, and Canterbury became famous as a seat of learning. The literary treasures accumulated at St. Mary's Monastery, York, threw the glories of Canterbury into the shade; and York, for a time, had the pre-eminence. The monasteries of Weymouth, Jarrow, Whitby, Glastonbury, Croyland, and Peterborough, were all famous for their libraries. Catalogues of some of these collections are yet extant, but the collections themselves have, in most instances, perished; some by fire, some by neglect, and some by the ravages of war. There was, however, a goodly remainder at the period of the dissolution of the monasteries. The memorable edict which reduced the grandest shrines in England to ruins, was fatal to the monastic libraries. From the vigorous protest of John Bale, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, we learn that two noble collections were sold to a merchant for forty shillings, and that he used them to wrap up his goods. So abundant was the supply, that it had, at the time of Bale's protest, served the merchant for ten years, and was likely to be available for ten years more. Priceless volumes were prostituted to the scouring of candlesticks, the rubbing of boots, and the wrapping up of soap and groceries. Whole ship-loads were consigned to foreign bookbinders, "to the wondering of the foreign nations." Some fragments were saved by the labours of Leland, but even these were lessened by the edict of Edward the Sixth, for "the culling out all superstitious books, as mis-sals, legends, and such like." At the same date, many of the Oxford libraries were "purged;" piles of the works of the fathers and schoolmen being burned in the market-place.

From a very remote date Oxford has been distinguished for the number and wealth of its libraries. The Carmelites,

who came into England about 1240, had, as we have already seen, a valuable collection of books there. The Franciscans had two collections in the city, and were so diligent in their efforts to procure additions, that the ire of old Anthony à Wood was excited against them, and he complained bitterly that no layman could buy a book because of the rapacious bibliomania of the monks. The Dominicans were not less industrious than their brethren of the order of St. Francis. No catalogue of their Oxford collection has survived, but there are records to prove that it was very rich, especially in the department of the occult sciences. Oxford is associated with the name of the celebrated Richard of Bury, or Richard d'Aungerville, the author of the *Philobiblion*, and subsequently Bishop of Durham, and Lord High Chancellor of England. He was a bookworm of the most enthusiastic type. Every nook of his palace was full. His bedroom was lined with goodly volumes; so much so, indeed, that it was impossible to enter or walk in it without treading upon a book. Paris was to him a very paradise, because of its libraries. In his *Philobiblion* he says of that city: "There are delightful libraries, in cells redolent and aromatic; there flourishing greenhouses, of all sorts of volumes; there academic meads trembling with the earthquake of Athenian peripatetics, pacing up and down; there the promontories of Parnassus, and the porticoes of the Stoics." He calls books "the masters who teach without flogging or fleeing, without punishment or payment." They are to him "as ears of corn, full of grain, to be rubbed only by apostolic hands; as golden pots of manna; as Noah's ark and Jacob's ladder, and Joshua's stones of testimony, and Gideon's lamps, and David's scrip." Such an enthusiast was likely to turn his vast resources and his singular opportunities to good account. By the lavish use of his purse and influence he succeeded in gathering what must have been in his days a noble collection of books. This collection he bequeathed to Durham College, Oxford—a college which occupied the site on which Trinity College now stands—and with it a handsome sum in perpetuity for its maintenance. Some of the books thus bequeathed were transferred to Duke Humphrey's library, and some to Balliol College, on the dissolution of Durham College by Henry the Eighth; but the majority were destroyed in the days of Edward the Sixth.

The colleges in the University of Oxford are in most instances possessed of valuable libraries, many of them of very early date. Prominent among them is the Library of All Souls', which still possesses books given to it by Henry the

Sixth. The splendid legacy of Colonel Codrington in 1710 of a library then valued at six thousand pounds, and of a sum of ten thousand in money, has made this collection one of the finest in the University. The Library of Queen's possesses records and registers dating as far back as 1362. It was enriched by the legacy of Dr. Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, in 1691. More recently a clergyman bequeathed to it the sum of thirty thousand pounds. The library of St. John's, which owes much of its excellence to the liberality of Archbishop Laud, is rich in *editiones principes* of Greek and Latin classics, and in rare tracts relating to English history. If the founder of Christ Church Library could have carried out his plans, the library of that College would have been the finest in the University. But his hopes were not realised: and it was left to Bishops Fell and Atterbury, and more particularly to Boyle, Earl of Orrery, and Archbishop Wake, to supply the Cardinal's lack. The collection bequeathed by the Archbishop was valued at ten thousand pounds. Lincoln College has a very valuable series of Greek and Latin MSS., collected by Sir George Wheler. Corpus Christi is remarkable for its set of the *Aldine Classics*, its rare MSS. and printed books, and its valuable collection of Italian literature. Wadham is rich in classics, early printed books, and the literature of the Continent; and Worcester is distinguished for its works on architecture. An approximate estimate of the MSS. possessed by the various college libraries gives the number at 1327. But it would appear that the authorities are strongly opposed to the giving of information. Even the Commissioners appointed by Parliament in 1852 failed to obtain any reliable statistics, as they were not empowered to collect any but volunteer evidence. That the college libraries are rich and numerous is certain; but what they contain, how they are managed, the date of their records and the amount of their endowments, are questions on which the general public must be satisfied to remain unenlightened.

The finest library in the University of Oxford, and in many respects one of the finest in the world, is the *Bodleian*, founded by Sir Thomas Bodley, at the close of the sixteenth century.

The germ of this splendid collection may be traced to a much earlier date. As early as 1320, Thomas Cobham, Bishop of Worcester, had made provision for building a room in the University, and furnishing it with books. Little, however, was done until 1367, when the work was begun, and the library was finally furnished and formed in 1409, under the title of Cobham's Library. It occupied a corner of St. Mary's

Church, where it would appear that there were some yet more ancient collections of books, stored in chests, and only lent out under pledges. By way of inducing benefactions, the Cobham librarian was ordered, in 1412, to offer masses yearly for the souls of those who had been donors of books. To encourage him in his devotions an allowance of half a mark was made to him annually; this was afterwards supplemented by a yearly endowment of five pounds, granted by Henry the Fourth, who was a large contributor to the Library. The regal stipend was regularly continued until the year 1856, when by the revised statutes "various small payments were consolidated."

In 1426 the University began the erection of the present Divinity School. The work would have broken down for want of funds but for the liberality of that enlightened patron of literature, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. This generous prince not only presented large sums of money to the building fund, but furnished between the years 1439 and 1446 a series of MSS., amounting to more than six hundred, which were deposited for the time in chests in the Cobham Library. So grateful were the authorities, that they forwarded a letter to the "worshepful parliament," announcing that the Duke had presented the University "a thousand pounds worth and more of preciose bokes," and beseeching their "sage discrecions to considere the gloriose gifts of the graciose prince . . . for the comyn profyte and worshyp of the Reme, to thanke hym hertyly, and also pray Godde to thanke hym in tyme comyn wher goode dedys ben rewarded." The room at St. Mary's being too small for the purpose, the University wrote to the Duke in July, 1444, informing him of their intention to erect a more suitable building, "of which (as a delicate way probably of bespeaking his aid towards the cost as well as of testifying their gratitude for past benefactions) they formally offered him the title of Founder." The building thus contemplated was finished about 1480, and now forms a portion of the Bodleian Reading-room. Although the MSS. given by the Duke, and others of his collection secured by the University after his death, were very valuable and numerous, only three out of the whole number are to be found in the present Library. One of these bears the Duke's arms, and another is enriched by his own autograph. Some of the collection have found their way to the British Museum, some to various colleges, but most of them are hopelessly lost.

The next name in the formal list of benefactors is that of Thomas Kempe, Bishop of London, who sent a valuable con-

tribution of books in 1487, as well as a sum of money towards the completion of the Divinity School. About this time a regular visitation was instituted, and various salutary rules for the administration of the Library were established. But in 1550 the Commissioners appointed by Edward the Sixth visited the University, and, with ruthless fanaticism, destroyed without exception "all MSS. ornamented by illuminations or rubricated initials, as being eminently Popish." The rest were left exposed to injury and the thief. No direct documentary evidence of this fatal devastation is known to exist, but an entry in the University Register in 1555 bears witness to the completeness of the catastrophe. It is the record of the appointment of a commission for selling the shelves and stalls in the public library. The books were gone, and their resting-places were of no further use.

At this crisis a name appears which will live and be famous to the end of time. Thomas Bodley was born at Exeter, in 1545. His earlier years of education were spent at Frankfort and Geneva, where, even before the age of fifteen, he pursued the study of Hebrew, Greek, and Divinity, with marvellous success. In 1559, he was entered at Magdalen College, Oxford, where he was admitted B.A. in 1563, and M.A. in 1566. In 1582, after a period of continental travel, and a second residence at Oxford, he was made gentleman-usher to Queen Elizabeth, and shortly after laid the foundation of his future fortune, and, it may be hoped, of domestic happiness too, by marrying the wealthy widow of a Bristol merchant. In 1585, he entered upon a course of honourable diplomacy, in which he distinguished himself highly. He was sent on an embassy to the King of Denmark, and was for many years ambassador at the Hague. Burleigh and Essex "vied with each other in the praises of the able diplomatist." But this rivalry was the cause of Bodley's discomfiture. He had naturally and reasonably expected promotion to some high office at home. The jealousy of Burleigh and Essex doomed him to disappointment. Each of them feared that Bodley's elevation would strengthen the position of his rival. Disappointed and disgusted, he resolved to abandon diplomacy, to renounce the spheres of intrigue, and to seek honour in a less perilous vocation. We have his own word for it, that "his keenly felt disappointment led him to undertake the enterprise which has immortalised his name." The new sphere of labour which he chose was the natural selection of a man of his tastes and pursuits. When a student at college, his soul must have been stirred within him by the traces of the ruthless de-

vastation which had been wrought by the commissioners of Edward the Sixth. "His stationer may have sold him books bound in fragments of those MSS. for which the University, but a century before, had consecrated the memory of her donors in her solemn prayers; the tailor who measured him for his sad-coloured doublet, may have done it with a strip of parchment brilliant with gold, that had consequently been condemned as Popish, or covered with strange symbols of an old heathen Greek's devising, that probably passed for magical and unlawful incantations." In the day of chagrin and mortified ambition the memory of these things came back to him, and suggested a course which might at least divert his mind from the disappointments of the past. So he writes, after indicating the reasons of his renunciation of Court life, "I concluded, at the last, to set up my staff at the Library door, in Oxon: being thoroughly persuaded that, in my solitude and surcease from the Commonwealth's affairs, I could not busy myself to better purpose than by reducing that place (which then in every part lay ruined and waste) to the public use of students." For the perfecting of this design, he confesses that he has "four kinds of aids"—a personal knowledge of ancient and modern languages, and other "sorts of scholastical literature;" a well-filled purse; a store of honourable friends favourable to the scheme; and plenty of leisure.

No sooner was the project entertained than Bodley set himself vigorously to work for its furtherance. In 1597, he wrote a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, formally undertaking to restore the ancient library to its former use; first, by refitting it with shelves and seats, then by benefactions of books and an annual endowment. As a preliminary, the beautiful roof, which even now is an object of admiration, was put up; the University arms being painted on the panels, and the arms of Bodley on the intervening bosses. The room having been suitably furnished, vigorous measures were taken to obtain books. Sir Thomas himself ransacked the stalls of the English booksellers. Experienced agents were despatched to the Continent, and charged to scour the markets of Paris, Venice, Padua, Milan, Florence, and Rome; and, afterwards, of Spain and Germany. An agreement for the supply of new books was entered into with the Company of Stationers. A register for the enrolment of the names of benefactors was provided; which register, in two folio volumes, still survives, and is an object of interest to all visitors. Books began to flow in from all quarters. Among these was the famous copy of the French *Romance of Alexander*; the MS. from which



John Fox took the text of the Saxon Gospels; an early edition, probably the *editio princeps*, of the Gospels in the Russian language; a series of valuable MSS. given by Thomas Allen, the astrologer, one of which contains an original drawing by St. Dunstan, of himself, prostrate at the feet of Christ; and eighty-one Latin MSS., given by the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, among which is "The Service-Book given to Exeter Cathedral, by Bishop Leofric, in the reign of Edward the Confessor, described in the *Registrum Benefactorum* simply as 'Missale Antiquissimum.'" About two thousand volumes having been collected, the Library was solemnly opened, on November 8th, 1602, by the Vice-Chancellor, and a procession of doctors and delegates.

The privilege of reading in the Library was restricted to graduates and donors, who might have six books given out to them at one time. On no account was any volume to be "given or lent to any person or persons, of whatsoever state or calling, upon any kind of caution or offer of security for faithful restitution." It would have been well if this sound and reasonable statute had been maintained in after years. Another of the early statutes was not quite so reasonable. It was that which enforced the celibacy of the librarian. This seems to have been a sore point with Sir Thomas—on what grounds it is impossible to discover—for when James, the first librarian, demanded permission to marry, the indignant founder expostulated with him on his "unseasonable and unreasonable motions." Bodley, however, "for the love he bore to James," allowed him to marry, but determined to render the statute inviolable in the future; and it was actually enforced until the year 1813, when it was so far modified, that the librarian and his assistants must be unmarried *at the time of their election!* In 1856, the fetter on the matrimonial inclinations of the librarians, actual or aspirant, was removed, and now the holders of the dignity may vary the quiet solitudes of literature with the more bustling amenities of domestic life.

Early in 1604, letters patent were granted by James the First, licensing the University to hold lands in mortmain for the maintenance of the Library, and styling it by the name of the founder. The royal pedant himself paid a visit to the newly entitled Bodleian in the August of the following year, and "indulged in the very mild pun, that the founder should rather be called Sir Thomas Godly than Bodley." He did more, however, than utter puns and platitudes; for he offered to Sir Thomas permission to carry away whatever books he

might choose from the libraries of the royal palaces. This grant was actually passed under the Privy Seal, but it does not appear that its provisions were ever carried out; there are but few volumes in the Bodleian which bear evidence of having come from the royal collections. From other quarters the Library was liberally endowed; so much so, that it became necessary to erect an eastern wing. This was completed in 1612, at the cost of the founder, probably with the assistance of a Crown grant of timber, and some contributions of the Bishop of London, "of moneys paid into court for commutation of penance." The permanent endowment of the Library was commenced by the purchase of certain tenements near Maidenhead and in London, producing an annual rental of £131 10s. A new agreement was made with the Stationers' Company, by means of which all members of the company were compelled to present a copy of works published by them within ten days of publication, under a penalty of three times the value of the book.

Sir Thomas Bodley died on the 28th of January, 1613, and was buried, by his own particular desire, in the chapel of Merton College, with a stately public funeral. The University gave itself straightway to grief and poetry. Two volumes of elegiac verses were issued, one of which was written by the members of Merton, and the other by members of the University in general. Among the latter were Laud and Isaac Casaubon, who furnished verses in Latin and Greek. Bodley bequeathed the greater part of his property for the completion of the schools and the east wing of the Library. Considering the claims of his family, this will was scarcely just; for according to one of Bodley's personal friends, he left little to his relations and servants, or to the children of his wife, to whom he was indebted for his wealth. Indeed, this friend charges the dead knight with having been "so drunk with the applause and vanitie of his librarie, that he made no conscience to rob Peter to pay Paul." Among the Rawlinson MSS., there may yet be seen a document which shows up this subject in bold relief. It is a petition addressed to the heads of houses and curators by the grand-nephew and niece of Bodley, asking for relief on the score of the liberality of their ancestor to the Library. The petition was very humbly conceived, but it was not so fruitful as might have been hoped. The curators gave to the petitioners the sum of four pounds, which the librarian and another evidently thought so shabby, that they supplemented the gratuity by a personal gift of ten shillings each.

The first noticeable gift to the Library after the founder's death, was the Barocci Collection, consisting of 242 volumes, which was purchased by the Earl of Pembroke for £700, and by him presented in a very graceful letter. According to Hudson, this was the most valuable collection that ever came into England at one time. A very choice collection of MSS., on vellum, numbering 238, was presented in 1634, by Sir Kenelm Digby. But he was distanced in the splendour of his benefactions by Archbishop Laud, who, in the spring of 1635, gave to the Library the first instalment of his magnificent donation of MSS., consisting of 462 volumes and five rolls. In the following year he sent 181 more, with five cabinets of coins in gold, silver and brass. These were followed by 555 MSS., in the next year, and in 1640, by 81 more, making a total of nearly 1,300, in more than twenty languages. Prominent among these is the *Codex Laudianus*, a MS. of the Acts of the Apostles, the date of which is between the sixth and eighth centuries. There are strong reasons for supposing that it belonged to the Venerable Bede. Yet more noticeable is the bequest of John Selden, under whose will there were added to the Library, in 1,659, about 8,000 volumes. During the interval between Selden's death, which occurred in 1654, many valuable books belonging to his collection were borrowed and lost. Eight chests of abbey registers and other MSS. relating to the history of England, were accidentally burnt in the Temple. The collection that found its way at last to the Bodleian is "rich in classics and science, theology and history, law and Hebrew literature." One priceless volume contains twenty-six English black-letter tracts, many of which are unique, and most of them the rarest of early tales and romances. Among the MSS. is Harding's *Chronicle*, the most curious feature of which is a map of Scotland, on which the author has placed "Styx, the infernal flode," and "The palaise of Pluto, King of Hel, neighbore to Scottz." Harding must have had some painful memories of the Scotch. In Selden's collection there are also fifty-four Greek MSS.

In 1673, the Library was enriched by the bequest of Thomas Lord Fairfax, who left to it twenty-eight valuable MSS., including the works of Chaucer, Gower, Wycliffe's Bible, &c., and the priceless collection of genealogical MSS. compiled by Roger Dodsworth, extending to 161 volumes. These would have fallen victims to the damp, but for the loving care of Anthony à Wood, who spent a month in "spreading them out in the sun upon the leads of the Schools' quadrangle." Fairfax had already rendered great service to the Library, for

when Oxford surrendered to the army of the Parliament, in 1646, his first care was to appoint a guard of soldiers to preserve the Bodleian. The Cavaliers, while in garrison there, gained much less credit; for it appears that they cut off the chains of many books, and actually stole a considerable number of volumes. Dr. Marshall, Rector of Lincoln College, who died in 1685, bequeathed 159 MSS., chiefly Oriental, including Coptic Gospels of great value. In 1691, the Library was enriched by the bequest of Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, who left to it 78 MSS., and all the printed books in his collection, which the Library did not possess. Among the latter are some rare tracts of the time of Charles the First; and also, "a copy of the famous *Expositio Sancti Jeronimi in Simbolo Apostolorum*," which was printed at Oxford, 1468. The Oriental MSS. of Dr. Edward Pococke, Regius Professor of Hebrew, in number 420, were purchased by the University in 1693, for £600. They include several precious works in Hebrew, Arabic, and Armenian, a few in Ethiopic, a Samaritan Pentateuch, and a Persian Evangelary. In the same year a purchase was made, for the sum of £700, of about 600 Oriental MSS., which were collected by Dr. Huntington, while chaplain to the English merchants at Aleppo. They include a Syrian copy of the works of Gregory Abulpharage, and a very fine Arabic MS. in folio, written in the year 1375, a sort of Egyptian Domesday book. Dibdin, in describing it, says: "The inspection of such a volume on the coldest possible morning, even when the thermometer stands at zero, is sufficient to warm the most torpid system." Another volume in this collection is in the Ouigour language, "a Tartar dialect, of which very few specimens are known to exist." The collection of Oriental MSS. was yet further enriched, in 1713, by the legacy of Marsh, Archbishop of Armagh, who bequeathed to the Library more than 700 volumes. Strange to say, no notice of this bequest is to be found in any of the registers.

Notwithstanding these large and liberal bequests, the growth of the Library in the seventeenth century was but slow. In the year 1714, it contained 30,169 printed volumes, and 5,916 MSS., being little more than double the number recorded in 1620. The well-known antiquary, Tanner, Bishop of St. Asaph, bequeathed a very valuable collection of MSS. and printed books in 1736. Among the printed books are some in early English divinity, in black letter, and of the utmost rarity. There is also a volume of tracts, some of which were printed by Caxton, such as the *Governayle of*

*Helthe*, the *Medicina Stomachi* (which is almost unique), and the *Ars Moriendi*, a wholly unknown edition. Tanner's collection, by a sad mischance, fell into the water on the transit from Norwich to Oxford. Their submergence for twenty-four hours has left upon them too evident marks. Nathanael Crynes, Fellow of St. John's, left a valuable collection of octavo and smaller size books, with a few quartos, in 1745. There are about 968 volumes, some of them of great rarity. The year 1755 was specially distinguished by the number of gifts by which the Library was enriched. Foremost among the donors was Richard Rawlinson, D.C.L., a bishop among the non-jurors, though passing in the world as a layman. For many years his name had figured frequently in the registers for gifts of coins, pictures, and books, as also for a few choice MSS. But at his death his whole collection fell to the Library, "formed abroad and at home, the pickings of chandlers' and grocers' waste-paper, the choice of book auctions, everything, especially in the shape of MS., from early copies of classics and fathers, to the well-nigh most recent log-books of sailors' voyages." The number of books bequeathed by him was between 1,800 and 1,900; the manuscripts, about 4,800, exclusive of charters and deeds. Among other volumes is a collection of "the original broadside proclamations issued through the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth." They are in beautiful condition, and of great value. There is also a copy of the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, of the eighth century; and a Psalter with the commentary of St. Bruno, of the eleventh century. In 1770, the Godwyn collection was added, consisting mainly of books published in the eighteenth century. A large number of *editiones principes* were purchased, in 1790, at the sale of the library of P. A. Crevenna. This purchase included the first entire Hebrew Bible, printed at Soncino, in 1488; for this, the sum of £43 15s. was given. At the same sale, the Bodleian acquired, at a cost of £127 15s., Fust and Schœffer's first dated Latin Bible (Mentz, 1462).

The earliest purchase of any note in the nineteenth century was the library of James Philip d'Orville, an eminent scholar, who died at Amsterdam in 1751. The sum of £1,025 was laid out in this purchase. The collection numbers between six and seven hundred volumes, the gem of which is a quarto MS. (387 leaves) of Euclid, which was written in 889. In 1809, the vast collection of the eminent topographer and antiquary, Richard Gough, was made over to the Bodleian by his executor, according to the provisions of his will. The

number of volumes thus secured was between three and four thousand. Among these, are a series of maps and topographical prints, in elephant folio; a collection of works relating to Anglo-Saxon literature; a series of rare drawings of church monuments in France, all the more precious because of the destruction of the monuments by revolutionary mobs; and a large and most valuable series of printed service books of the English Church before the Reformation. This last series includes thirty-nine Missals, twenty-one Breviaries, eleven Manuals, eleven Processionals, and twenty-five Hours, irrespective of MSS. In the same year the University purchased, for £1,000, the splendid MS. collection of Dr. Edward E. Clarke, the traveller. The gem of this collection is a MS. of Plato's Dialogues, on 418 vellum leaves, written in the year 896.

The largest purchase in the history of the Bodleian was that of the Canonici collection of MSS., which was bought in 1817 for the sum of £5,444. Canonici was a Venetian Jesuit, who, after having formed a museum of statues and medals at Parma, which he was obliged to sell, on account of the expulsion of the Jesuits from the State, and a collection of objects of religious interest, which the rector of the order thought "little suitable to a poor monk," gathered together at Venice a library of the rarest and choicest books, obtained from the brethren in all parts of the world, with the idea of presenting it to the Jesuits' College at Venice, in the event of the restoration of the Order. The MSS. number 2,045, and comprise 128 volumes in Greek, chiefly of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; 311 volumes of Latin classics and mediæval poets, including a Virgil of the tenth century; 93 Latin Bibles—one written in 1178; 232 volumes of ecclesiastical writers and fathers; and 576 volumes of miscellanies. In addition there are 270 Liturgical books, about 300 volumes of Italian MSS., and about 135 Oriental MSS., among which is a copy of *Maimonides on the Law*, dated 1366. In 1821 the Library was enriched by the famous collection of English dramatic literature and early poetry, formed by Edmund Malone, an Irish barrister and graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. It was bequeathed by him to his brother, Lord Sunderlin, with the understanding that if not preserved in the family as an heir-loom it should be deposited in some public library. Lord Sunderlin transferred it to the Bodleian. It consists of upwards of 800 volumes, of the greatest rarity, there being many first quartos of Shakespeare's plays, and first and second folios of his collected works. The sum of



£950 was spent in 1824 in the purchase of valuable works which supplied deficiencies in foreign history and law, at the sale of the Library of the Meermans at the Hague. In the same year the Bodleian obtained, under the will of Mrs. Denyer, a most precious collection of early editions of the English Bible, including first and second editions of Coverdale's, Cranmer's, and Tyndale's New Testament, 1536, Erasmus' Testament, 1540, and many others.

The year 1829 was distinguished by the acquisition, by purchase, of the famous Oppenheimer collection, at a cost of £280. This collection, to the formation of which David Oppenheimer, Chief Rabbi at Prague, devoted more than fifty years, consists of upwards of five thousand volumes, of which 7,880 are MSS. in Hebrew. Among other invaluable works it includes a copy of the *Talmud*, in twenty-four folio volumes, printed on vellum, and bearing date 1713—28. According to Archdeacon Cotton, it is "the grandest and most extensive vellum publication extant." The magnificent library of Francis Douce, consisting of 393 MSS., 98 charters, and about 16,480 printed volumes, with a large collection of early prints, drawings, and coins, became the property of the Bodleian, under the will of the collector, in the year 1834. Among other rarities, it contains three volumes of *Horæ*, one belonging to the sixteenth century; a second, which was the property of Mary de' Medici, and another dated 1527, executed for the wife of Sigismund the First, of Poland. "These," says Mr. Macray, "are priceless gems." A Psalter of the ninth century, on purple vellum, is another gem. The collection is rich in Bibles, Primers, Books of Common Prayer, and Psalters. There are no less than 311 specimens of the typography of the fifteenth century. There is also a large collection of chap-books and children's penny books, and two folio volumes of black-letter ballads.

The Sutherland collection was presented to the University in the year 1837. It consists of a magnificent series of historical prints and drawings, on the formation of which Mr. Sutherland and his widow expended upwards of twenty thousand pounds. "The six volumes of the folio edition of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and Life*, and of Burnet's *Own Times*, are inlaid and bound in sixty-one elephant folio volumes, and illustrated with the enormous number of 19,224 portraits of every person and views of every place in any way mentioned in the text or connected with its subject-matter." The extent of this collection may be guessed from the fact that it contains "184 portraits of James I., of which 135 are

distinct plates; 743 of Charles I., of which 573 are distinct plates, besides 16 drawings; 373 of Cromwell, 253 plates; 552 of Charles II., 428 plates; 276 of James II.; 175 of Mary II., 143 plates; and 431 of William III., of which 363 are separate plates." There are also 309 views of London, and of Westminster 166. In 1843 the valuable collection of Oriental MSS. formed by Bruce, the celebrated traveller, was purchased for a thousand pounds. It comprises twenty-six volumes in Ethiopic, seventy in Arabic, and one Coptic MS. on papyrus. In one of the volumes is a copy of the *Book of Enoch*, brought by Bruce from Abyssinia. Only three MS. copies of this book are known to exist, and of these the Bodleian possesses two. About 750 Oriental MSS., chiefly in Persian, with a few in Arabic, Sanscrit, Zend, &c., gathered by Sir William Ouseley, were purchased in 1844 for £2,000. The valuable collection of Hebrew MSS., consisting of 862 volumes, amassed by H. J. Michael, was purchased at Hamburg in the year 1848 for £1,030. In 1852 the Italian Library of Count Alessandro Mortara, comprising some 1,400 choice volumes, was bought for £1,000. The Trustees of the Ashmolean Museum transferred to the Bodleian, in 1860, the printed books and MSS. formerly deposited in the museum. They amount altogether to 3,700 volumes, and contain the collections of Ashmole, Anthony à Wood, Dr. Lister, Sir William Dugdale, and John Aubrey. Fresh additions are made each year, and special attention has been given of late to the formation of a series of editions of the English Bible. The number now collected is very large, and approaches very nearly to a complete gathering of every edition before 1800, which has any claim to regard either from date, imprint, variety of size, correctness, or incorrectness." As an illustration, a copy of Barker's (1631) Bible, in which the word "not" is omitted from the Seventh Commandment, was bought for £40. The printer was fined 100 marks for this error, and the edition was rigidly suppressed.

It would be impossible, within the compass allotted to this article, to give even a sketch of the treasures of the Bodleian. Though in point of numbers it falls beneath many of the great libraries, it is equal to any of them in the quality of its works, and in some departments superior to all. Its Oriental MSS. are finer and more extensive than those of any other collection, and in this department it is gaining augmentations year by year. Its Biblical Codices are of worth, and very numerous. In addition to the *Codex Laudianus*, already mentioned, it possesses the *Codex Ebnerianus*, which belongs

to the twelfth century, and contains the whole of the New Testament, excepting the Apocalypse. In Rabbinical literature the Library has, probably, no rival. The MSS. of the Dodsworth and Rawlinson collections give it the highest rank in the department of British history; while those which belong to the department of early British literature, including several of Gower, the *Troy-book*, of Lydgate, and the *Romance of Alexander*, are of inestimable worth; the Junian *Caedmon*, an Anglo-Saxon MS. of the tenth or eleventh century, is of itself sufficient to distinguish a library. Nor is the Bodleian less richly endowed in the department of printed books. Its *editiones principes* of the Greek and Latin classics, culled from the famous collections of Pinelli and Crevenna, give it an eminence in this branch of literary wealth second only, if second at all, to the Imperial Library of Vienna. It contains a choice collection of the early English printers, Caxton, Pynson, and Wynkyn de Worde, as also of the productions of the famous presses of Oxford, St. Alban's, Tavistock, and York. In vellum-printed books of the fifteenth century it is singularly rich, containing, among others, "the Mentz Psalter and the *Rationale*, of 1459; the Mentz Bible, of 1462; the Ciceros, of 1465 and 1466; the *Clementis V. Constitutiones*, of 1467; the *Paris Sallust* of circa 1470;" and many others of equal rarity and worth. There is also a remarkable series of vellum books of a later date.

Among the curiosities of the Bodleian are:—a copy of the New Testament, said to be bound in a piece of Charles the First's waistcoat; a copy of the grand Latin Bible, printed by Gutenberg, about 1455—the first book printed from moveable types—a copy of *The Recuyell of the Histories of Troy*, the first book printed in the English language; a remarkably large and perfect copy of Coverdale's Bible, 1535, the first complete Bible printed in English; the Persian poem of *Joseph and Zuleikha*, which is said to be the most beautiful MS. in the world, both for the elegance of the handwriting and the elaborateness of the decoration; King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of Pope Gregory the Great's Treatise, *De Cura Pastoralis*, the very copy presented by the king to Werfrith, Bishop of Worcester; a Latin Psalter, of the tenth century, written in Anglo-Saxon characters, and decorated with grotesque initials; a curious precursor of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, entitled, *Ye Dreame of Pilgrimage of ye Soule*, translated "into Inglissh," in the year 1400, illustrated with coloured drawings; a German Bible, printed in 1541, with texts on the fly-leaves, in the handwriting of Luther and

Melanchthon; a Latin translation of an Italian sermon, by Queen Elizabeth, written in her own hand, and sent, as a new year's gift, to her brother, Edward the Sixth, with a Latin dedication; an *Evangeliarium*, of the tenth century, on the cover of which is a beautiful ivory diptych; a *Psalterium*, of the thirteenth century, bound in solid silver, on which are engraved the Annunciation and Coronation of the Virgin; a fine MS. of the Koran, from the Library of Tippoo Sahib, at Seringapatam; a Latin exercise book, in quarto, which seems to have been written jointly by Edward the Sixth and Elizabeth; &c. &c. Noticeable among the curiosities is a MS. *Horæ*, which belonged to Queen Mary, and appears to have been presented by her to one of her ladies. It contains 224 leaves, and is exquisitely ornamented in the tint called *camaieu gris*. The following inscription is in Mary's hand:—"Geate you such riches as when the shype is broken, may swyme away with the master. For dyverse chances take away the goods of fortune; but the goods of the soul, whyche bee only the trewe goods, nother fyer nor water can take away. Yf you take labour and payne to doo a vertuous thyng, the labour goeth away, and the vertue remayneth. Yf through pleasure you do any vicious thyng, the pleasure goeth away and the vice remayneth. Good Madame, for my sake, remember thys.—Your lovyng mystres, Mary Princesse."

Among the curiosities, some of which can scarcely be called literary, may be found a chair made of the wood of the ship—"The Golden Hind"—in which Sir Francis Drake sailed round the world. It bears a plate on which are some lines in Latin and English, by Abraham Cowley. Near to this is the famous Guy Fawkes' Lantern, which was presented to the University by Robert Heywood, of Brasenose. There is no doubt that this is the very lantern which was found on the person of Fawkes in the crypt of the Parliament House. There are also a Telugu MS. printed on palm leaves; an oaken platter, made of the wood of the tree in which Charles the Second was concealed; two Runic Almanacks, one in the form of a walking stick, and the other an oblong block; a pair of white leather gloves, worn by Queen Elizabeth when she visited the University in 1566; the Book of Proverbs, written by Mrs. Esther Inglis, in 1599, every chapter being in a different style of caligraphy; a Burmese MS. written on thirty-nine gilded palm leaves; an English astrological calendar of the fourteenth century, very rare and curious; an *Historical Roll*, upwards of thirteen feet long, showing the

descent of the English kings, from the expedition of Jason in search of the Golden Fleece, to the accession of Edward I.; four specimens of papyrus rolls from Herculaneum, burnt to a cinder; and an ornament said to have been worn by Hampden when he fell at Chalgrove Field, inscribed with the couplet:—

“Against my king I do not fight,  
But for my king and kingdom’s right.”

There is also a fine copy of Æsop, printed in 1518, which is supposed to have been presented by Henry the Eighth to Anne Boleyn. Add to this the iron chest which was given by Bodley for the moneys of the Library, and which is of beautiful workmanship; two volumes belonging to Queen Elizabeth, both of which were bound by herself, and one of them a translation from the French of *The Miroir or Glasse of the Synnefull Soule*, executed by her when only eleven years old; a little volume of 103 closely written duodecimo pages, entitled the *Supplication of Soules*, by Sir Thomas More, entirely in his own hand; and an Aldine copy of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, with an autograph of William Shakespeare; and, among many other curious things, which it is impossible now to tabulate, the original charter granted to Gloucester Abbey, by Burgred, King of Mercia, in 862. It is in admirable preservation. A *black Negro baby*, preserved in spirits, was presented by Mr. Müller, of Amsterdam, with a collection of natural curiosities. *They* have found their way to the new museum, but the black baby has mysteriously disappeared.

The Library possesses a very valuable collection of coins, but these have never been fully arranged and indexed. Many of them are exceedingly rare. There is also a curious collection of Roman weights; a collection of Italian medals, and matrices of seals, chiefly foreign; a collection of the gun-money struck by James II. in Ireland; and a choice cabinet of Napoleon medals. In the Browne Willis collection of coins, there is a gold *Allectus*, and there are also the famous *Reddite* and *Petition* crowns of Thomas Simon, the latter being struck in 1663. There are also drawings by Raffaello and Holbein, one of the latter having been the property of Jane Seymour; busts, carvings, maps, models, casts, wax impressions of seals and portraits, many of which are by the first masters and of the highest merit. The exquisite portrait of Sir Kenelm Digby, which is one of the gems of the Bodleian, is supposed to be the work of Vandyke.

In 1860 the Radcliffe Trustees proposed to Convocation to transfer the noble building under their control to the use of the Bodleian, as a reading-room. The offer was thankfully

accepted, the building remaining still the property of the Trustees, who retained the responsibility of its maintenance. The Radcliffe Library of Medicine and Natural History was removed to the new Museum. The building was so altered as to be capable of holding about 75,000 volumes, and it was resolved that the space thus gained should be appropriated to new books and magazines, systematically arranged. The new reading-room—the comfort of which cannot be too highly estimated—is open from 10 A.M. to 10 P.M.; and thus an opportunity is given to students for availing themselves of the benefit of the Bodleian after college hours, as well as to others, not collegians, to whom the limited hours of the Bodleian have always been a great drawback.

The number of printed volumes at present in the Library may be approximately estimated at 350,000. The manuscripts number about 25,000. Many of the printed volumes as well as the MSS. contain several distinct works under one cover. Compared numerically with other libraries, the Bodleian must seem small and almost unimportant. There are at least nine libraries, the number of printed books in which is in advance of the Bodleian. The Library of the University of Göttingen contains upwards of 360,000 volumes; the Royal and University Library of Breslau, 350,000; the Imperial Library of Vienna, 370,000; the Royal Libraries of Copenhagen, Munich and Berlin, respectively 410,000, 480,000, and 510,000; the Imperial Public Library of St. Petersburg, 530,000; the British Museum, from 700,000 to 800,000; and the Imperial Library of Paris between 800,000 and 900,000. But only one foreign library contains a vaster collection of manuscripts—the Imperial Library of Paris—and thousands of the Paris collection are of very inferior value, many of them being charters. In the mere number of its MSS. the Bodleian stands *third*; but if single and unique treasures be left out of the question, it is probable that in the general character of its manuscript department it stands *first*. Englishmen are too prone to depreciate their institutions. The literary cant of the day denounces our museums, our art galleries, our architecture, statuary, and our art generally. But though we be somewhat behind our neighbours in some departments—in none so far behind as the critics of the day would teach us—we have the satisfaction of knowing, on the most unanswerable testimony, that in the Bodleian Library we have very nearly the finest collection of manuscripts, and in the British Museum the very finest collection of printed, books in the world.



The increase of the Library is dependent on three sources—benefactions, purchases, and legal exactions. The first of these is of course so arbitrary and contingent, as to be reducible to no definite ratio of supply. The second involves two necessities—that there shall be available funds, and an appropriate market. There are plenty of books in the world, but they are not always on sale; and the occurrence of sales is not always coincident with the possession of funds. The funds of the Bodleian, though largely augmented by the bequest of £36,000, Three per Cents., from the Rev. Robert Mason, D.D., in 1841, are not by any means so plentiful as they ought to be. In 1780, a statute was passed, imposing “an annual fee of four shillings on all persons entitled to read in the Library.” In 1813 and 1855, other statutes were passed, raising the payment to eight shillings. But, in 1861, the various fees were consolidated, and it was agreed that a fixed annual sum of £2,800 should be contributed from the University chest. In special cases, as for the purpose of obtaining rare and choice books at the Pinelli and Crevenna sales, voluntary contributions are solicited. But this is a source of supply to which an institution like the Bodleian ought not to resort. Some idea of the approximate average growth of the Library by purchases, may be formed from a table drawn up by Mr. Edwards, ranging over the years from 1826 to 1842, inclusive. During that period, 37,063 volumes of printed books and manuscripts were purchased, at a cost of £26,207 10s., or an average of a little more than £1,540 per annum. Since 1842, there have been but few very large purchases. The Bruce collection cost £1,000; the Oriental MSS. of Sir William Ouseley were purchased for £2,000; the Michael MSS. cost £1,030; the Italian library of Count Mortara cost £1,000; thirty-nine Persian and Arabic MSS. from Sir Gore Ouseley’s collection, were purchased for £500; two sets of English newspapers cost £200 each; Cromwell’s Great Bible was secured for £100; and three Greek Codices were obtained from Professor Tischendorf, for £373.

The annual rate of ordinary increase of printed books, exclusive of purchases and donations, may be reckoned at about 3,000 volumes. This brings us to consider the third source on which the increase of the Library is dependent—that is, legal exaction. This plan of contributing to the growth of national and public libraries is of ancient date. It has been very generally adopted, not only in countries under despotic government, but where the constitution has been liberal and free. It is recognised alike in the Empire of Russia and the

American Republic. The rate at which this tax on publishers is levied varies in different countries. In France, one copy of every book published must be sent to the Imperial Library of Paris; in Belgium and the Netherlands, the practice is not compulsory in all cases, but it is the necessary condition of copyright; in Sardinia, one copy of every work published must be furnished to the University of Turin; in the Papal States the law varies, and is inoperative, but in Rome itself, five copies of each work must be sent to the master of the Sacred Palace, one of which he retains for his office, one he forwards to the vicar-general, one to the Vatican, one to the Gymnasium or Sapienza, and one he returns. The National Library of Madrid claims one copy of every work published; the provincial libraries have a right to a copy of such works as are printed within their respective provinces. The National Library of Lisbon, the Town Library of Oporto, the Royal Library of Munich, the Royal Library of Hanover, the University Library of Göttingen, the Royal Library of Berlin, claim one copy each of all books published in the countries to which they belong. In Saxony, one copy is presented to an appointed officer, who forwards it, according to its subject, either to the Royal Library at Dresden, or the Library of the University at Leipzig. The Libraries of Stockholm, Upsal, and Lund, claim one copy each; Geneva has the same privilege; and at Zurich it is customary, but not compulsory. The Imperial Library of St. Petersburg demands two copies of all works printed in Russia; and, by an Act of Congress passed in 1790, and subsequently extended, one copy of every copyright work issued in the United States must be forwarded to the State Department at Washington.

In the year 1610, as we have already seen, Sir Thomas Bodley entered into an engagement with the Stationers' Company, by which they were pledged to grant to the Library "one perfect copy of every book printed by them, on condition that they should have liberty to borrow the books thus given, if needed for reprinting, and also to examine, collate, and copy the books which were given by others." The first book given in pursuance of this indenture is now in the Library, and is entitled *Christian Religion, Substantially, Methodicallie, Plainlie, and Profitable Treatised*. In effecting this agreement, Bodley complains of having met with "many rubs and delays." Scarcely two years after the indenture was drawn up, it was necessary to draw up a second, by which defaulters were bound to forfeit to the Company three times the value of the book which they had neglected to send. This

agreement was confirmed by an order of the Star Chamber in 1637, but it was indifferently kept. The University records contain many complaints of neglect and delay. The first parliamentary statute on this subject is contained in the Act of 14 Charles II. c. 33, by which it was made obligatory on the Stationers' Company to deliver one copy of each work published by them to his Majesty's Library, the Bodleian, and the Cambridge University. This statute was in force for two years, and was renewed from time to time until the passing of the Copyright Act of 8 Queen Anne. This Act required the depositing of copies of all works entered at Stationers' Hall at nine libraries in England and Scotland. By the 41 Geo. III. c. 107, this number was extended to eleven. The privileged libraries were the Royal, Bodleian, University of Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrew's, King's College, Aberdeen; Sion College; Advocates', Edinburgh; Trinity College, Dublin; and Kings'-inn Library, Dublin. This Act remained in force until 1835. By 5 and 6 William IV. c. 100, the number of privileged libraries was reduced to five, the excluded *six* receiving in lieu of the privilege an annual grant charged on the Consolidated Fund, "the amount of which was based on a computation of the value of the books which each of them had respectively received on an average of a certain number of years prior to the passing of this Act." How very various the operation of the former Act had been may be judged from the fact that while the average annual value of books received under it by the University Library of Glasgow was £707, the annual average of Sion College Library, entitled to precisely the same privileges, was only £363. The number of books, periodicals, and pieces of music received by the Cambridge University Library from 1844 to 1850 was 52,348; during the same period the number received by the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, was 21,260. By 54 Geo. III. c. 156, the copy due from the Stationers' Company must be delivered at the British Museum, irrespectively of demand. The Bodleian and other privileged libraries must make their claim in writing, within twelve months of publication. The result is that many works published in the provinces, and not a few in the metropolis, never find their way to the Bodleian.

The imperfect working of the Act indicates the necessity of fresh legislation. The tax itself is oppressive, and in some cases most seriously so. The enforcement of a five-fold presentation of a splendid and costly work like *Gould's Birds of Australia*, instanced by Mr. Edwards, is positively cruel to

the proprietor and publisher; and it probably tends to the discouragement of such magnificent works. It takes out of the roll of customers the very persons and institutions upon whom the producer has a right to calculate. That copies of all works published should be laid up in our national and university libraries is right; but the libraries thus enriched should be made public, and the cost of such enrichment should not fall upon authors and publishers, but on the Consolidated Fund. In the event of fresh legislation on this question, there are two other points which should be taken into account—a fair and comprehensive scheme for securing all works published in the colonies, and a scheme for national interchanges. There can be no perfect system of library accumulation which does not make provision for securing a copy of every work published in the world. In these days of gigantic enterprise the proportions of such a scheme as this are not too colossal.

In the year 1605 (and not in 1600, as the writer of the article on *Libraries* in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* states), appeared the first catalogue of the Bodleian. It was compiled by Dr. James, the librarian, and included printed books and manuscripts. It is a quarto volume, of 425 pages, with an appendix of 230. A second edition, consisting of 539 pages, quarto, in double columns, was published by James in 1620, after his resignation of the office of librarian. The classified arrangement adopted in the first edition is abandoned in favour of an alphabet of names. In the title-page an appendix is mentioned, but no copy of it can be found. The librarian, John Rouse, published an appendix in 1635, consisting of 208 quarto pages, in double columns. The whole series of catalogues and appendices up to this date could be purchased for five shillings. The third catalogue of printed books was published in 1674 by Dr. Hyde, who then held the office of librarian. It is a folio volume of 750 pages; the compiler speaks most plaintively of the nine weary years spent in its production, but Hearne actually asserts that the real work was done by Pritchard, the janitor, and that Hyde did little beyond writing the dedication and the preface! The fourth catalogue (which in Mr. Macray's volume is called the *third*, and corrected to *fourth* in the *errata*) was issued in 1738. It is in two folio volumes, containing 611 and 714 pages respectively. It professes to have been compiled by Bowles and Fysher, both librarians, and by Langford, Vice-Principal of Hart Hall. But from the statements of Hearne it would appear that the catalogue was virtually prepared by the irascible antiquary

himself. Whoever prepared it, it is a work of remarkable accuracy, and is yet of great use. In 1787 the first part of a catalogue of the Oriental MSS. was issued, in folio, under the superintendence of John Uri, a pupil of Schultens. There is reason to believe he spent twenty-one years in its compilation. The second part of this catalogue was commenced by Dr. Nicoll, the eminent linguist, who published an instalment in 1821. His premature death occurred before the completion of his task; and it was taken up by Dr. Pusey, who published a second instalment in 1835. The first portion of a catalogue of the Clarke MSS. was issued by Dr. Gaisford in 1812, and the second part in 1814 by Dr. Nicoll. A catalogue of the Gough Collection was published by the University Press, in quarto, in 1814; it was compiled by Drs. Bliss and Bandinel. A new catalogue of the general library of printed books, not including the Douce and Gough collections, was issued in 1843. It was compiled by the Rev. Messrs. Browne, Cary, and Hackman, and is in three folio volumes. The cost of compilation and printing was about £5,000. A supplemental catalogue, comprehending all additions made between 1835 and 1847, was published in 1851, under Mr. Hackman's editorship. The present librarian, the Rev. H. O. Coxe, published a catalogue of Greek Biblical MSS. in 1853, and another (Part I.) of Latin Biblical and classical MSS., in 1858. A catalogue of the Douce Collection was published in one folio volume, in 1840; the compilers being Mr. H. Symonds and Mr. Coxe. Count Mortara drew up a catalogue of the Canonici Collection, which was published, in quarto, in 1864. Mr. Macray compiled a catalogue, in one volume quarto, of a portion of the Rawlinson Collection, which was printed in 1862.

A new general catalogue was commenced in 1859, on the plan in use at the British Museum. A large staff was organised, consisting of a general superintendent, five transcribers, three attendants, and a binder. They are now at work, but many years must elapse before their labours can be successfully closed. "At present," says Mr. Macray, "the letters A, F, G, H, are catalogued; and the extent to which the whole catalogue will run may be estimated from the fact that the letters B, C, and G, fill sixty, sixty-five, and thirty-four volumes respectively."

The Library is under the control of a Board, which consists of the Vice-Chancellor, the two Proctors, the five Regius Professors, and five members of Convocation, elected by that House for ten years. All members of the University who are graduates have the right to use it. Undergraduates are

admitted upon bringing letters of recommendation from their tutors. Strangers who wish to read in the Library are admitted upon introduction by a Master of Arts; but every facility is most courteously offered by the librarian to strangers who apply personally for permission to make researches. The fee for showing the Library and picture gallery to visitors is threepence. In 1720 it was a penny, which was the perquisite of the porter. It subsequently rose to a shilling, but the curators reduced the charge to threepence, excepting in the case of those who were accompanied by a member of the University in his academic dress. Lucky individuals who have thus a friend at court evade the charge of threepence, and go free. But why make any charge at all, and so wither the bloom of Bodleian courtesy and generosity? The janitor does not reap the benefit of it, and as a source of income to the University it cannot be very prolific. It can be scarcely regarded as a test of respectability.

There are many questions of interest pertaining to the general administration of the Library, which space forbids us to discuss, and which indeed are yet very unsettled. One of the most important of these is the question of *loans*. This was taken up by the Oxford University Commissioners in their Report (1852); who were of opinion that, while it was undesirable that an indiscriminate permission to take out books should be given, yet that, under certain restrictions and in peculiar cases, books and even MSS. should be taken from the Bodleian on loan. It has been already seen that Sir Thomas Bodley was decidedly opposed to the system of lending. So strong were the statutes of the Library on this point, that when in 1645 King Charles sent, under the authorisation of the Vice-Chancellor, to borrow a volume, the librarian showed the King the law, and his Majesty at once ordered that the will of the founder should be piously observed. In 1654 the Lord Protector applied for the loan of a MS.; the librarian sent him a copy of the statute, and Cromwell had the good sense to be satisfied. It is said that John Selden was so offended by the refusal of the University to lend him a MS. except on a bond of £1,000, that he revoked the bequest of his library to the Bodleian, and left it to be disposed of by his executors according to their will. This story, however, is probably apocryphal. On the general question, much may be said both for and against the removal of books from the Library. The Advocates' Library at Edinburgh has lost between 6,000 and 7,000 volumes by the facilities afforded to borrowers. On the other hand, the cause



of literature has doubtless lost much by the restrictive rule. There are, unfortunately, some cases on record in which books have been borrowed without permission, and not returned. Two extremely rare tracts, *The Epitaph of Sir P. Sydney*, and *Feast Full of Sad Cheere*, by Churchyard, have been cut out of the volume in which they are bound. Another rare book from Tanner's collection, *The Children of the Chapel Stript and Whipt*, has vanished. But a few years ago a small book was laid on a shelf near the door, on a somewhat exciting Convocation day. "On proceeding to restore it to its place, that place was found to be occupied by another book." This led to inquiry, and it was discovered that the book had been missing for so long a time that all hope of its restoration had been abandoned. In the register books it was found that this volume had been delivered to a reader in 1807. He had kept it fifty years, and then conscience prevailed. But the most remarkable case shall be told in Mr. Macray's own words:—

"In the year 1789 the Library was visited by Henry E. G. Paulus, of Jena, afterwards the too well-known author of the *Leben Jesu*, who copied from Pococke MS. 32 (a small octavo volume) an Arabic translation of Isaiah made in Hebrew characters by R. Saadiah, which he published in the following year, transposed into Arabic characters. Thenceforward the MS. was lost from the Library, although no direct evidence of the manner of its disappearance appears to have been obtained. But after the death of Paulus, in the year 1850, a bookseller at Breslau, to whom the volume had in some way been offered, entered into communication with the librarian, Dr. Bandinel, and the result was that the missing MS. was at length restored, *clothed in an entirely different German binding*, and with all trace of its original ownership removed, to its right place."

We cannot close this paper without noticing the courtesy and kindness of the Bodleian staff. Their ability and their readiness to offer all reasonable facilities to students are proverbial. The reserve and suspicion which characterise the authorities of some of the college libraries are unknown at the Bodleian. And we would fain hope that the long tenure of office which has fallen to the lot of later librarians—that of Dr. Price extended from 1768 to 1813, and that of Dr. Bandinel from 1813 to 1860—may be accorded to the learned and enlightened gentleman who at present holds the arduous but honourable position.

---

ART. VI.—*The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ.* Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1868, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C. and Fellow of Winchester College; Rector of Brighthelmston, Isle of Wight. Oxford and London: John Parker and Co., 1868.

THE last Bampton lecture is a very able volume; but we confess that we are disappointed with it. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in all its fulness and in its manifold relations to the whole compass of doctrine, is the most urgent subject of the present day; that one topic in Christian theology which most pressingly demands exhibition. The Person of our Lord has been the subject of a recent predecessor of Dr. Moberly, and we venture to think that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, in His eternal possession and temporal mission, should have been treated in the same universal and exhaustive style. Instead of this we have the relation of the Spirit to the Church exhibited in a style which cannot be regarded as other than for the most part polemical. The lectures never rise, after the first, into anything like a tranquil investigation of the supreme functions of the Comforter; the authority of the Divinely commissioned, hereditary dispensers of sacramental grace is hardly ever lost sight of; and many points of profound interest, such as the relation of the Holy Ghost to the incarnation, work, and atonement of Christ, His agency in the inspiration, defence, and exposition of Christian truth, are merely glanced at, and in a manner so brief and vague as to be less satisfactory than perfect silence would have been. It may, indeed, be said that the Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ is a topic that prescribes its own limitation. We can hardly assent to this. There is no limitation, in one sense, to this subject; at any rate it essentially involves all those questions of theological, ecclesiastical, ritualistic, polemical, and devotional interest that are now agitating the mind of universal Christendom.

The first lecture, on the gradual development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is full of the noblest truth, most nobly expressed. Here we prefer the general statements to the more specific definitions of the several economies, which are not marked out as progressive manifestations of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, but rather as progressive revelations of

the Incarnation and its great end, the Atonement. We must quote a few sentences; the clear notes of which not only Oxford, but all England, needs to hear:—

“It is a deep and good thought that as the fall of man necessitated the separate operation of the three Persons of the most Holy Trinity to restore him to the favour of God and salvation, so the doctrine of the most Holy Trinity—first, in its anticipations supporting the hopeful faith of patriarchs, and afterwards, in its full development—became also the basis—more than the basis, the summary—of all Divine revelation, on the faith of which mankind should obtain that favour and that salvation. . . .

“It is beside my purpose to enter more fully into the consideration of this which I have called the second age of the development of the doctrine of God—the age of Immanuel, God among men. It was necessary that Christ should be born, and suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day. It was necessary that He should not only give us the pattern of sinless obedience and perfect holiness, but that He should also bear our sins in His own body on the tree, giving His life a ransom for many, reconciling God to sinners by reconciling sinners to God, blotting out upon the Cross the handwriting that was against us, the fatal indictment of our guilt. *It was necessary.* And God forbid that in our pride of shallow reasoning we should attempt to question the necessity of that Divine Sacrifice, or its efficacy for our salvation! If the atonement of Christ for sin, the purchase of the souls and bodies of men by His blood shed upon the Cross, be not the truth, the very truth, of God, then is the Church of God mistaken from the beginning; nor is there any word or record of God safe from the arts of those who would elevate their own philosophy into the ultimate criterion of all truth, and the only reasonable rule of all belief.” —P. 10.

After an elaborate and forcible summary of the preliminary announcements concerning the Divine Spirit, the lecturer approaches the subject of his volume in the following way:—

“But the most immediate, characteristic, and peculiar presence of God among us in this the third age, is His presence in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit dwelt in the Redeemer Himself without measure or degree, sanctifying and making holy in the most perfect manner the man Christ Jesus. Of that fulness the Lord breathed upon the Apostles even before the ascension. When on the Day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit came down in the fuller and more peculiar manner that characterises His presence in the Church, the Church received the full gift which her Lord had partially bestowed on her before; and in that presence she retained His presence also. Thenceforward, the Spirit sanctifying the Church at large and the separate members of it, Christ walked in the Church, and the separate members became Christ-

bearing; Christ being formed in them, according to the language of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians, by the Holy Spirit. Thenceforward, I say, the Holy Spirit dwelt in the Church of Christ, dwelling in the souls of Christian people. Great words these, brethren, and very wonderful words! which, though they be the expression of the ordinary belief of Christians ever so slightly learned in the mysteries of the Christian faith, contain in them the germ of all the deep questions on the subject of God and man which have perplexed, and will, no doubt, continue to perplex, the minds of men till the end of time."—P. 17.

Then follow some striking passages on the extreme mystery that encompasses all that pertains to the intercourse between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man; the mystery incomprehensible that an Almighty Spirit should create other spirits capable of free obedience and of free transgression—"the very wonder of Omnipotence;"—that the Supreme Spirit, unfettered by any conditions, save those of goodness and truth, can have created other beings, to be beings possessed of a freedom given by Himself, and yet in its exercise independent of Himself, capable of thinking and doing that which He would fain they did not do, *free* to act out their Creator's design and will in creating them, or to run counter to it; free "to fly in the face of God that made it." This mystery is, if possible, rendered more dread when the Fall is taken into account. "The simple directness of the will was warped, the free created spirit fell continually. No longer harmonising in all its movements with the Almighty creating Spirit, it incurred extreme corruption of sin, and the habits of sin, growing on from father to son, pervaded large tracts of human kind with an awful degeneracy, from which the spirit of man himself could in no wise rescue or restore itself."

The good that has been always in the world is attributed not to the nature of man still retaining some memorials of its original dignity, but to the constant help given by God to degenerated spirits. Thus, in the first age, the Creator was a distant father, accepting through spirits the worship of His chosen people, and keeping mankind from total ruin and the condition of devils, sustaining hopes more or less distinct of a future restoration. During the brief sojourn of Christ upon earth, the same God became our Brother, Example, Atoning Sacrifice and Lord; while in the third age He becomes our "close, inward, heart-sanctifying Inmate," the Source of all Divine strength, and all acceptable service. As we have intimated, these distinctions are scarcely conformed to the scriptural view:—one and the same Holy Spirit in every age

moving upon the hearts of men, but progressively revealed and more and more largely given according to the revelation of the atonement through which He was obtained for man.

There are three elements of doctrine with respect to the administration of the Holy Ghost, which lie at the foundation of this volume, and in regard to which we shall make a few remarks. The first is expressed by the formula, Spirit-bearing Church; the second, is the doctrine of the representative priesthood, acting at once for the Holy Ghost and for the whole congregation; and the third is the personal priesthood.

We have no disposition to quarrel needlessly with words or figures of speech, especially in the case of a writer so original as Dr. Moberly. But the notion that the Church is the bearer and communicator of the Holy Spirit, is one which is not found in Scripture, and was not current in early theology. The idea seems, as it is everywhere prominent in this book, and in the theory it represents, that the influences of the Holy Spirit are a boundless deposit, which the merit of Christ committed to the Church for distribution. Hence we read of its being traced "from the unmeasured fulness of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ Himself, to the measured and divided sufficiency with which the same gift was imparted to the Apostles, and through them to the Church at large. The doctrine of the New Testament is that the Holy Spirit, a gift to Christ's Divine-human person before the cross, and hence a gift in all His language when speaking to His disciples, was, on the Day of Pentecost, a Person who came to take possession of the Church, and to be in it a living presence, performing all personal acts of preaching, teaching, government, conversion, sanctification, as directly by Himself as if in some most mysterious manner we could behold Him and hear His voice, and witness all the concomitants of His government. With this compare the following sentence:—"The visible descent of the dove not only designated, but empowered also the man Christ Jesus to be in all time to His Church the sole baptiser with the Holy Ghost, the one and single source through whom, by such channels and media as He should choose and empower, the Holy Spirit should pass in an orderly and covenanted way for the sanctification and salvation of man."

According to this view, the wonderful meaning of the great Pentecostal crisis, so eloquently dwelt upon elsewhere, is forgotten. Does it not seem altogether out of harmony with the dignity of the greatest day in the economy of the revelation of the Trinity, to make the Holy Ghost pass in an orderly and covenanted way from hand to hand, from generation to

generation, to the end of time? Whatever else the Scripture teaches concerning the transmission of authority from Christ to the Apostles, and from the Apostles to their successors for ever, the gift of the Holy Ghost is never so spoken of. We shall see presently that no text is ever appealed to. The theory is assumed; it is affirmed in language of the Fathers who held it; but no evidence is adduced from the fountain of our authority. That theory is, we repeat, that the Holy Spirit who dwelt without measure in the Lord Himself, was by Him imparted to twelve men, in order to be imparted to others. The twelve were become, for purposes of spiritual administration, the living and life-giving Church. They were become the spirit-bearing and spirit-transmitting body of Christ. Now what they received from Christ must have been only the influence of the Divine Spirit. But on the day of Pentecost the Spirit Himself came down to be Himself what this theory makes the Apostles: to use them, indeed, as the patriarchs of the Church, but not in the sense that Dr. Moberly preaches.

"Then, when all this was duly done, and the glorification of the Lord consummated by His ascension in the flesh, everything preliminary to the full effusion of the Spirit was completed. Ten days more of solemn waiting, and then, at length, in visible form as of divided tongues of fire, and with the sound of a mighty rushing wind, He descended on the great Day of Pentecost. It was from the Father that the dove had come forth and remained upon the head of the Son on the banks of Jordan. It was by the Son that the tongues of fire were sent down which sate upon the head of twelve in one of the chambers, if it be so, of the Temple at Jerusalem. I say, brethren, upon the head of twelve; for though I am aware that many of the greatest ancient writers speak of the tongues as one hundred and twenty, the number of the disciples who were together at the election of St. Matthias, yet even these appear to acknowledge at other times that, for the purpose of succession and derived authority, the gift was in the Apostles alone. So, for instance, St. Augustine, who at other times speaks confidently of there having been a hundred and twenty tongues, says:—'He thoroughly bathed the Apostles with the spring of living light, so that they afterwards, like twelve rays of the sun, and as many torches of truth, should illuminate the whole world, and inebriated, should fill it with new wine, and should water the thirsty heart of the nations.' I wish, therefore, to be understood, not as denying that the number of those on whom the tongues rested exceeded twelve—though I confess that I doubt it—but as meaning that on twelve, and twelve only, they rested in such sort as to make them the patriarchs of the family of Christ, the channels for the communication of the graces of the Holy Spirit, in His orderly and covenanted methods, to the sons of men."—P. 39.



This view of the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost seems to us a very superficial one. It violates the plain language of the historian, loses sight of the spirit and tendency of the whole chapter, and needlessly elevates the Apostles at the expense of the universal Church. When the Day of Pentecost was fully come, the promised Comforter was sent to the Church already prepared for Him, and filled the upper room, where one hundred and twenty were gathered together, with the tokens of His presence. His symbol sealed the forehead of every saint, even as His presence sealed every heart. The Spirit of Glory rested on each, to signify that henceforward every individual believer should rejoice in the tokens of conscious acceptance with God. That glory took the form of fire, to signify that every such accepted believer should be purged and sanctified by the fire of sanctifying discipline. And the fiery glory was distributed in the form of tongues, to signify that the sealed and regenerate disciples of Christ should bear testimony with their lips, in devotion to God, and words of charity to man, to the power of the new Christian life. Not a word is said of the restriction of this glorious gift, in any sense whatever, to the company of the Apostles. On the contrary, St. Peter, when the first worship of the morning passed into preaching, proclaimed that the signs of the Spirit's presence, which the people marvelled at, were the fulfilment of the prophet Joel's prediction that upon all classes alike and upon every age the Spirit should be poured out. All that the quotation from St. Augustine says, we echo, and give to the Apostolical company a dignity and authority and influence as large as theory ever stretched to—larger, indeed, than is given by the hierarchical party, for we give them an unshared and untransmitted authority—but holders of the Holy Ghost, and dispensers of His influence, as if He and not the Incarnate were in heaven, we cannot suffer them to be termed.

"No sooner, however, had the Twelve received the power from on high, for which they had been bidden by the Lord to tarry in the city of Jerusalem, than they began to impart it to others. Perhaps we may not unduly generalise here, and drawing a Christian universe from this particular, say that the true fire of the Holy Spirit can never be present in any man without its calling him instantly upon endeavouring to diffuse that light and heat to others beside himself. However, on that very morning they began to baptise, and baptising—whether by their own unassisted hands or no—not fewer than two hundred and fifty people apiece between nine o'clock in the forenoon and night, had already exhibited the beginning of that irrepressible growth of the sacred body of Christ, which should cause it to

resemble the grain of mustard-seed in its enlargement, and the multiplication of the buried corn of wheat. To the three thousand men and women that day planted into the body of Christ the Holy Spirit was given. . . . Thus began—to be continued to the whole multitude of Christian people in every age of the Church—the transmitted graces of personal holiness and acceptableness in Christ, the precious personal graces by means of which men and women planted into Christ are to reach salvation.”—P. 48.

Had the Apostles been representatives of the whole Church, in its possession of the Holy Ghost, we should have been told so. Had they been the sole dispensers of that Spirit in holy baptism, we should have found them always connected with that sacrament, and presiding over the administration of it with the most jealous and solemn care. But we find it otherwise. It hardly needs proof that they did not baptise the thousands of the first ingathering, or the thousands of the second, mounting as they soon did to myriads. Dr. Moberly very clearly shows that baptism is the act of the whole Church by its representative, and admits to what a large extent lay-baptism is found in the New Testament, and sanctioned in the early Church. But how can this be reconciled with a Divinely appointed succession of men privileged to be the legitimate dispensers of the life of the Holy Spirit? Does it not seem as if the Holy Spirit so ordered events and the narrative of events as to obviate this vain notion, and to save the dispensation of this gift from so mechanical a perversion? The only instances in which the impartation of the Holy Ghost is expressly and in a marked manner connected with the Apostles, are those of the Samaritan converts recognised by the Apostolic deputation from Jerusalem, and the residuary disciples of John the Baptist whom St. Paul prayed over, and who, through his instrumentality, obtained the gift of the Spirit. But these two cases stand alone, and suggest to the thoughtful mind their own solution. Samaria was specially honoured for the sake of Him who had sowed the fields now reaped, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on them was as it were a minor Pentecost in honour of the half-Jewish race received into the fold. Similarly the dispensation of the Baptist receives the same honour, and Ephesus is the last scene of those heavenly phenomena which marked the apostolic prerogatives in the communication of the Holy Ghost.

The doctrine of the New Testament, confirmed by the history of Christianity from the beginning till now, is that the Holy Spirit dispenses His own gifts through Word and Sacrament; but not through the ministration of any order of

men whose jurisdiction over the grace of Heaven is the result of an hereditary transmission of prerogative. This so-called Apostolical succession pervades these lectures consistently and in its most absolute form ; but the free and healthy tone of three-fourths of it seems to us to fight against the theory which it establishes.

"I will venture, then, to say that there meet at the scene of such holy baptism, the two parents (to speak, I trust, with no irreverent boldness) of the Divine birth of the Holy Ghost in the infant's soul. First, there is assuredly the sacred presence of God ;—specifically of God the Son, of Him who was designated and empowered by the Holy Ghost at Jordan to be the baptiser with the Holy Ghost, the Father of the new birth of the soul. But Christ the great High Priest, invisibly present and doing His own Divine, spiritual work invisibly, acts visibly through His visible representatives, and His great representative upon earth is the priestly Church—and she, representing her Lord, performs the visible and outward acts to which is attached, by the mercy of God, the communication of the Divine Fatherhood. . . . The ordained clergyman, therefore, being the personal representative in the present case of the Church, which in point of priestliness is one with her Lord, is to be regarded as the human channel, so far as man may be said to be so, of the Divine Fatherhood of the new birth."—P. 142.

May we not ask St. Paul's testing question to the advocates of this rigid theory, *Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?* the Holy Ghost, that is, as a Divine Person, as much present in all the Communion and in all the assemblies of His Church as Christ Himself was present in the ante-chamber of the cross, instituting His Supper? The irresistible thought suggested by all that we here read, is that the personality of the Holy Ghost is lost. Were that remembered we should not hear so much of Christ as the only baptiser, and the ordained ministry the only media, of the regenerating influences of the Spirit. The always present personality of the Divine Spirit is to this school of theology an embarrassment. And it is curious to observe how page after page flows on without the most distant recognition of that free living Person whose voice speaks and whose ever various presence is felt in the Church with a spontaneity and Divine omnipotence that uses instruments indeed, but cannot be holden of them.

As in relation to the Sacrament of Baptism, so also in relation to the Holy Communion, the co-operation of the whole Church is very earnestly vindicated, as against the abuses of Romanism. Their great *Amen* ratifies and completes even the sacred words of the consecrating priest. But whilst he condemns Rome—the private masses, the single action of the

sacrificing priest perfecting the sacrifice, are very severely dealt with—the lecturer seems scarcely conscious how strict an affinity there is between the later abuses and the theory which he enunciates, accompanying it by certain strange concessions. We are told that to constitute its complete character according to the Divine pattern of its institution—though where to seek that Divine pattern we are not told—there must be the consecration of the elements by the priest, the organ of the priestly Church, empowered by sacred ordinance to do that “indispensable portion of the joint act which none else may presume to exercise or intrude upon.” By the act that he organically does, and the word which he organically utters, the spiritual presence of the Lord is so brought down upon the elements of bread and wine, as that to the faithful they become verily and indeed, however invisibly and mysteriously, the body and blood of Christ. Remembering how great a latitude the inspiration of Scripture demanded in regard to baptism, it is found necessary to guard against extending the same principle to the Communion; though on what ground the difference is established between the two Sacraments we fail to see. “There has never been a question of the absolute confinement of the power of consecrating the bread and wine to their mysterious efficacy of becoming to the faithful and to the Church of the faithful the body and blood of the Lord, to the ordained clergy.”

But it should be remembered that the same catena that establishes this last point conducts to the dogma of transubstantiation, and the veritable sacrifice of the mass, and none who hold the one can be free from a certain temptation and tendency to desire the other. Hence the lecturer's answer to the question whether the feast celebrated is or is not a sacrifice :—

“It appears to me to be little more than a question of words which bears upon no important issue. The feast is what it is; and whether that is or is not what constitutes a sacrifice, must depend altogether upon the precise meaning attached to the word ‘sacrifice,’ and the definition given to it. There surely are good and innocent senses in which it may well and rightly be so called; there surely is a sense, the highest—that in which the actual offering of the Lord's body and blood upon the altar of the Cross was once offered, the only full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world—in which we may not dare so to call it. It is perhaps conceivable that in the eyes of Him who from His seat in eternity looks upon the things of time, as the Lamb was once slain from the foundation of the world so the great sacrifice and all its sacred commemorations, its typ e

faithfully celebrated before, its commemorations faithfully celebrated after, may be wholly and absolutely one, the one work of Christ in Himself and His people. I know not; but we, whose standpoint is in the things of time, cannot speak so. We could not, without the express word of Holy Writ, have spoken of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. To us there is before and after. To us our blessed Lord came, and died, and rose, and ascended at definite dates in this series of things. We must not confound time and eternity, nor our doings with the Lord's doings. It may sound humble, but I believe it is really presumptuous to do so. I know not why we should not rest content to speak in the language of St. Chrysostom, which I have already quoted, and to call the feast which we celebrate our *Θυσία*, or *Ἀνάμνησις τῆς Θυσίας*, our sacrifice, or recollection of the sacrifice."—P. 176.

It is precisely this kind of indeterminate, mystical reasoning that led the way, step by step, slowly but surely and with fatal precision, to the final Lateran decree. Such a mode of stating the question is a virtual abandonment of the principles of the Reformation, which absolutely refused to admit any approach to philosophical theory—transubstantiation is nothing more in reality, and at the outset,—and restly firmly on the plain and implicitly asserted doctrine of Scripture. It is a tone of conciliation that will conciliate none, especially as it is subsequently modified in some very essential respects. The Romanist teachers will smile at it; their Ritualist imitators, who are making the ceremonial pave the way for the doctrine, will think it very feeble; while all the orthodox will mourn that such uncertain sounds should be heard from a pulpit and lectureship set for the defence of the Gospel.

We cannot bring our minds to believe that the Word of God has left the second Sacrament so indeterminate as the general tenor of modern teaching would indicate. The sayings of our Lord and His Apostles afford no ground whatever for either transubstantiation or consubstantiation. Dr. Moberly very properly says that the latter, like the former, is a *theory* of the *manner* of the presence, a theory with which the Church has nothing to do, knowing the presence as a fact. But he exaggerates that presence, not so much by enlarging with too much profuseness upon the direct communications of which the Sacrament is the channel, as by a silent and negative exclusion of other instrumentalities and means of grace in relation to those gifts. The Sacrament, it seems to us, has reference not only to the great impartation of which it is the sign, but also to all the other means of grace. It is the sign and seal that in every meeting of His people around

His name Christ will be present ; that the whole circle of the appointed ordinances, private and public, shall be made fruitful of grace and edification, that Christ will everywhere and in all give Himself. As the Sabbath is the sign of the sanctity of time, so the Eucharist is the sign (among other things) of the sanctity, fruitfulness, and abundant blessing of all the means of grace. This view is too much overlooked in this volume, and in the general theory of which this volume is an exponent. But it is a view that alone accords with the freedom and Divine omnipotence of authority with which the Holy Spirit acts in the Christian Church.

The relation of the Feast to the unity of the Church is very earnestly exhibited, and with special reference to the evils of our times. The lecturer rightly declares that this side of the sacred meaning of the Sacrament is as important as that other which is more frequently urged. It is a witness and a bond of that mystical union of believers in the body of Christ, which Christ Himself in the High-priestly prayer desired for His people, the witness to the world of His own Divine mission. Meanwhile, how does this bear upon the state of things throughout Christendom, and throughout our own land in particular ? If this Sacrament is really received as the witness of a mystical union of the mystical body of Christ, this glorious principle ought to preserve him who holds it from unduly pressing its relation to a visible unity. At any rate, one would think that a devout mind, witnessing the evident fact that the spiritual fellowship of Christ's people in this land is divided up into a number of denominations and separate communions, who all partake the same bread and wine, and, in the strength of that Saviour whom the bread and wine exhibit to them, perform all the works of Christianity, bear all its burdens, and devote themselves to its service, would be disposed to resort to every expedient rather than attach to the Lord's Supper an ecclesiastical theory which makes it to all but one community a solemn delusion, if nothing worse. One would think that the pious clergymen of these days, with Rome on the one hand and the masses of earnest Dissent on the other, would be unable to hold out against a more free and tolerant interpretation of Scripture. But it is not so.

There is nothing nobler and truer in modern English theology than Dr. Moberly's lecture on "The Personal Priesthood," so far as that subject is regarded in itself, and not as the counterpart of the hierarchical priesthood, and as complicated with a baptismal theory. But before we reach those passages we have to listen to very much that is confusing as to the



earlier and secret influences of the Divine Spirit. Vicarious faith is supposed to have admitted the soul to the holy sacramental and outwardly administered gifts of Divine grace ; but yet, strange to say, there has not sprung up, under the action of the inwardly operating Spirit of God, that personal and sacred faith, that conscious willing faith that leadeth to salvation, which "assimilates the blessed exterior gifts of grace," and which is absolutely necessary to form the basis of the high position of personal priesthood in Christ. All this implies that the life given in baptism, and which, "when once extinct, absolutely extinct, knows no means of restoration," has in the hearts of the ungodly baptised been latent, completely latent, but by no means lost ; that every, the most abandoned, sinner whose life began with the baptismal formula, must be addressed as one who has in him the new life of Christian regeneration, a spark and germ not yet quenched nor destroyed.

The lecturer says :—"I mean to distinguish three separate cases—the first, the simplest, wherein the conversion of persons of mature age, the faith that leads the way to salvation springs in the heart first, secretly, Divinely, and is after a time so far matured as to receive the seal of holy baptism." Here we must needs pause and consider what advantage is gained by abandoning the language of Scripture on this subject. What does the Scripture teach but that the Holy Spirit is through the preaching of the Word, whether to the congregations of the Church or the unbaptised crowds without, a Spirit of conviction, testifying against sin in every form, and producing the sentiments of sorrow that belong to what the Bible calls the "gift of repentance" ? A sinful life and a sinful heart are precisely the same in the baptised and in the unbaptised ; and the state which is here supposed to be consistent with a latent baptismal life is one that the Word of God declares to be the mark and sign of the unregenerate. In regard to this first class of which the lecturer speaks, the way of a sinner's conversion, repentance, and regeneration is not that which is described in the Acts of the Apostles. Let us turn to the second class ; "the second, the happiest, where vicarious faith is accepted for an infant child, and the indispensable personal faith grows up, regularly and sweetly strengthening, under the perpetual dew of the graces which descend upon it through all the exterior ministrations of Christ's Church." It would be very hard indeed for the writer of this sentence to explain his words so as to give them a valid or Scriptural meaning. Vicarious faith must at some

conscious moment become personal faith. We can understand preliminary influences imparted in answer to the prayer of others, and in honour of vicarious faith, especially in response to the infinite and irresistible intercession of the all-holy Saviour. We can understand a state of heart given from the beginning which would prepare for the thankful acceptance of the Saviour, when He should come to claim His own. But there is no propriety in making any exception to the universal New Testament doctrine, that personal, conscious acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ, is the condition of adoption, regeneration and life. Passing, however, to a more definite expression of theory :—

“The third, the most anxious, where vicarious faith has been equally accepted for the child in unconscious infancy, but the signs of personal faith, the indications of the working of the Holy Spirit in the heart, the marks of the activity of the new nature bestowed by the new birth are, alas ! not to be recognised. To such as these the conversion of the soul—a real, inward, secret turning of the soul to God in Christ (I do not speak of the fictitious conversions, the foolish excitements which afflict our poor country parishes, scattering away all sober reverence, engendering all kinds of presumption and conceit)—a real, inward, secret turning of the soul to God in Christ, the secret work of the Holy Spirit is absolutely needful. . . . And therefore I hail the preaching of conversion as a great need of these unspiritual times ; not such a preaching as should in any degree depreciate the blessed gift of Holy Baptism. God forbid ! Nor such as should lead any one to doubt the exceeding happiness of such as from the blessing of Christian homes, and early imbibing of the rich gifts which belong to the infant child of God, have never known the dreariness of feeling exiled, the dry heart which cannot pray, the feeling of scornful doubt and unbelief ; but such a preaching of conversion as might, by the blessing of God, be not unhelpful towards wakening up the beginnings of that personal faith and repentance—that conscious and willing faith and repentance—which, alike in the baptised and in those who are not yet baptised, leadeth the way unto salvation.”—P. 248.

It would be equally difficult for the lecturer to reconcile these words with his own principles elsewhere expressed, or with the teaching of the Word of God. The turning of the soul to God is no doubt an inward and secret matter in some respects, but in others nothing is more public and manifest. The true preaching of conversion is still what it ever was ; “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead.” And conversion itself is very often mingled with very much of what the world calls “foolish excitement,” so often, indeed, and in such a large majority of cases, that reverence and humility in

a teacher of religion should in respect to them silence satire. It is refreshing to turn to such words as these, and there are not a few of them :—

“In the power of his own personal priesthood he may go before God in repentance and hearty confession of sin ; laying his conscience bare before God, and weeping over sins—which no man knows, it may be, nor necessarily need know—whether they be sins of secret thought by which he has dishonoured God in the deeps of his inner soul, or sins of word, or overt sins of deed and act, in the only presence of his loving and merciful Father which is in heaven. And in so doing he may entirely assure himself that as certainly as his Father knoweth already all the details and aggravations of those sins, before he utters them in word, or mourns over them in heart, so certainly He loveth to see His son in Christ prostrate himself, with all the burden of his soul, in filial confession at His feet. He has a right in Christ to the absolute assurance of forgiveness, in so far as he knows and feels, and does not deceive himself in knowing and feeling, that his repentance is real, and his confession earnest and true. He doth not need that any man should necessarily come between God and his own priestly soul, in order to win, or in any way obtain for him the pardon and the peace which are promised to faithful confession : ‘ For if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.’ ”—P. 253.

Dr. Moberly, like all other good men in this day of unaccomplished desires and unrealised ideals, longs for unity. He does not dwell so much on the union of Christendom as a whole—there is something too vast in this for a mere excursus, or subordinate paragraph—but spends many sentences on the means of healing the divisions of our own land. But he scarcely takes the right method of winning attention to his voice, when he speaks thus of the origin of the communions severed from the Church of England :—

“In these days of division and separation, when not only national churches are disjoined from one another, but every parish in our own Christian country is so divided against itself in matters of religion, that Dissent numbers well-nigh as many, if not, in some cases, quite as many, adherents as the true and Apostolical Church of God in the land, it seems to be a matter of the most primary and pressing importance to press upon men’s minds this aspect of the holy and mysterious efficacy of the blessed Communion. It has been, I think, the weakness and deficiency of the Church of England in the revival of earnestness which ensued, more or less, upon the preaching of Wesley and Whitfield, that it has preached religion chiefly in that subjective manner, if I may so term it, which they and their followers adopted. To preach the Gospel was to present the atonement of

Christ to the fervid faith of sinners. To preach spiritually was to refer everything that could conceivably be good or acceptable to God absolutely to the workings of God in the soul. To preach faith was to discountenance the preaching of repentance and holiness as such, to keep out of sight, or at least in a very secondary position, external means and helps of grace, and to teach men that they must be saved by abandoning and utterly disclaiming all idea of being or becoming good, really good, themselves. If this be the true and entire preaching of the Gospel, I do not know what I have to say to the Dissenter who deserts his parish-church and goes to the meeting-house. He feels himself edified by what he hears there. He hears what he considers to be the Gospel. He is convinced that he has been at a definite time and with distinct consciousness converted by the Holy Spirit, and having been so perceptibly converted is saved for ever. He tells me that he has faith in Christ, and that he prays. I know that he is often a man of exemplary life and apparent piety. How can I urge him to leave his chapel and come to church?"—P. 157.

We do not accept this as a fair account of the preaching that founded, built up, and brought to something like ecclesiastical order the later Nonconformist communities of our country. Some measure of truth there may be as it respects isolated individuals, whether teachers or taught. But the division of the one Church of God in this country is a fact that is here but very superficially accounted for. Something more than mere defect of Sacramental teaching has filled the chapels of Dissent, and it will never be by the restoration of sacramental teaching that the unity of the Church in this country will be brought about. The "thin religionism" of our day requires a more effectual cure than that; and will not be remedied but by the more abundant influence of that Personal Spirit living in the churches of this land, and making Himself felt through His Word, whose influences this doctrine would far too rigidly connect with Sacramental ordinances. It is grievous to see how this theory interferes to mar the most beautiful expressions of Christian feeling in this volume. Acknowledging, as Dr. Moberly does, that there is a deep, secret unity in Christ which none dare fathom or limit, he cannot help bringing his theory between the member of Christ's mystical body and his assurance of salvation, and, begrudging the soul, whom the Lord upbraideth not, his privilege, warns him against a too bold confidence. "The regenerating Spirit may no doubt move, if He will, upon the hitherto unregenerate spirit of a man, and give him, without human aid or interference, the sacred new birth which brings salvation—yet, unless we have risen, and been baptised, and washed away

our sins in the consecrated elemental water, we may not presume that that mysterious change has passed upon our souls, even as we must not doubt the fact that it has done so when that outward rite has been duly done." How unreal is all this, when we remember that those of whom the lecturer speaks have been baptised, as a rule, in their infancy, and cannot be re-baptised. How unreal, also, is the caution against a too joyful assurance of life in the participation of Christ. There may be a deep invisible unity, Dr. Moberly thinks, wherein the souls of men, divided on earth even to persecution on the one hand, and suffering on the other, may yet be, through clinging to God in Christ, bound together in the Spirit; they may, indeed, be fed mysteriously on the spiritual body and blood of the Redeemer; and yet they must not presume that it is so unless the internal evidences are ratified by external observances. "None may presume upon this doctrine, comforting though it be, nor venture to assure himself that he is a sharer in that secret bond, so as to be a member incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, which is the blessed number of all faithful people, unless he derive that assurance also from the use of those outward means to which Christ has given the mysterious power of conveying it, and which He has made the pledge to our souls that it is conveyed." This is the language which Romanists use to Anglicans, and Anglicans to Methodists. It may seem a hard thing to say; but we feel assured that, on the principles held by the high ecclesiastical party of this land, we can defend ourselves better against them than they can defend themselves against Rome.

The lecturer dwells very much on the great fact that all authority and prerogative rest finally with the entire body of the Church; a grand truth as wielded in the argument with the Papacy, but one that becomes exceedingly embarrassing when applied as a standard to the present actual state of the English Church, and very humiliating when it is made to mark the difference between Anglicanism and the rival communions. Sentences might be quoted here to show that the lecturer is almost hopeless of his Church as the servant and instrument of the State, and despairs of that combined action of clergy and laity which is the strength and glory of the true Church of Christ. But he lays down his principles, and utters his protest calmly, and then proceeds as follows:—

"I also venture to think that, if both sides of the great twofold truth which it has been my wish to put forward were fully realised in their respective and united strength, they might be found to help

in throwing light upon many questions of no slight importance and difficulty which are now pressing upon the Church. For example, the extremely urgent questions of winning back into the full brotherhood and communion of the Church the Wesleyan body—men who by no professed difference of doctrine, nor, apparently, by any insuperable difficulty in respect to discipline—with great gifts of earnestness and influence, have slid away from us, against their founder's earnest desire and repeatedly expressed warning—might seem to be not wholly incapable of solution; if we took deeply into our hearts the mighty scope for every sort of various action in the Church, which the full doctrine of the general priestliness of all the members of the body of Christ brings prominently into view.”—P. 238.

We have elsewhere given our version of the general response of Methodism to such appeals and quasi-appeals as this. The Methodist people must be content to go on their way, believing in their Saviour's name, doing His work, and bearing His burden, in all simplicity of heart. They think that their ecclesiastical position does not depend upon any wish or will of him who is called their founder; they venture to believe that the Divine Spirit was their founder, raising them up, as He raised up other communions before them, to be a silent and, if need be, a loud and earnest protest against many of the doctrines and practices of those who invite them back. They believe that they have a bond, though an unacknowledged one, with the ancient Church of the land; even as they have a bond, and an acknowledged one, with the other Nonconformist communions. They rejoice in what they retain in common with the doctrine and discipline and worship of the mother community; they rejoice in what they hold in common with other churches around them; but mainly they rejoice in their heritage of the faith once delivered to the saints, in their tokens of the communion of the one free living Spirit, and in the labour of love which it is their honour to engage in throughout the world for the name of the common Lord. Whatever be the peculiarities of their position, in it they are called and in it they must abide with God.

But we must abruptly conclude; and not without expressing our respect for the reverence and devotion and sound learning of a book from which, in many most important respects, we widely dissent.

---



ART. VII.—*Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England.* By the late JOHN LORD CAMPBELL, LL.D. Vol. VIII. *Lords Lyndhurst and Brougham.* London: John Murray. 1869.

THE closing volume of Lord Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors* is certainly not inferior to any of its predecessors in the interest arising from the character of its subjects. Lyndhurst and Brougham, in the brilliance of their intellect, in the great share they took in public affairs, and in the prominence of their position before the public eye, surpass all who have held the Great Seal in these later times. Their biographer had the advantage of a long and intimate personal knowledge of both of them, and of being associated with them in some degree in public business. The reader who knows nothing of Lord Campbell's former writings takes up the volume, expecting to find a friendly and generous estimate of the characters of men so immeasurably superior to himself; but, alas! "no man is a hero to his valet;" and neither Lyndhurst nor Brougham presents anything heroic, as depicted by Lord Campbell.

John Singleton Copley, afterwards Lord Lyndhurst, and four times Lord High Chancellor of England, was the son of John Singleton Copley, an artist already eminent in Boston, then a colonial city, and an integral part of the British Empire. He was born in 1772, and in 1774 his father came to England, where, after a brief Continental tour, he established himself as a painter; painting portraits for wealth, and historical pictures for fame. Among his best known works were the *Victory of General Wolfe*, and the *Death of the Earl of Chatham*. Lord Campbell tries to persuade us that Lyndhurst was unreasonably ashamed of his family, but has no better evidence to adduce than the silence of Debrett, Lodge, and Burke, which proves nothing; while, on the other hand, he records the fact, that the son, in the days of his greatness, received his aristocratic guests in the same house in George Street, Hanover Square, in which his father might have painted the portraits of theirs.

In 1786, young Copley was at school at Clapham, and is reported to have sent some poetry to a young lady. The lines happen to have been preserved. Lord Campbell suspects them to have been copied from a scrap-book, because the professed lover was never afterwards known to versify. The insinuation

of literary dishonesty is characteristic; but an ex-Chancellor ought to have known, from his experience as guardian of many infant wards, if in no other way, that there are emotions which, at a certain age in educated young people, do bubble into verse, and there is no reason why the brilliant Copley should be an exception.

But his first great distinctions were won at Cambridge, where he was admitted in 1790. He did not profess to be a hard student, and his high spirits doubtless occasionally betrayed him into idleness and dissipation; but the general character of his work, as well as the thoroughness of his previous training, was evidenced by the result. He was second Wrangler of his year, and he acquired a Fellowship in Trinity College at the first attempt, thus taking rank at once as an able mathematician, and an accomplished classical scholar.

Fresh from Cambridge, he was admitted a member of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, and became a pupil of Tidd, the special pleader. When sufficiently prepared, he began to practise as special pleader under the bar; but not succeeding as he expected, he resolved on being called to the bar himself. After a short visit to America, of which the records are unhappily lost—unhappily, because there would have been a real historic interest in his impressions of the Transatlantic cities and their citizens, and in his descriptions of his travelling companion, the refugee, who was afterwards Louis Philippe, and of his sojourn of some days with the illustrious Washington—he entered on the career which eventually led him to such splendid success. He was called to the bar on the 7th of June, 1804, and became a candidate for business in the Court of King's Bench and in the Midland Circuit.

Of course his rise was slow. The most splendid abilities seldom secure forensic eminence without long delay. The British attorney is careful of the interests of his clients, and is conscientiously shy of an untried man. Lord Campbell tells us that it used to be said there were only four ways in which a young man could get on at the bar. "1. By *huggery*. 2. By writing a law-book. 3. By quarter sessions. 4. By a miracle." Copley did not get on by *huggery*, that is, by giving dinners to the attorneys, and suppers to their clerks, like the great *nisi prius* leader Tom Tewkesbury, the hero of "the Pleaders' Guide:"

"Nor did I not their clerks invite  
To taste said venison hashed at night;  
For well I knew that hopeful fry  
My rising merit would descry."

He did not write any law-books, and he made no great figure at the quarter sessions; he could therefore only rise by miracle, which came in the form of an opportunity to make a great speech before an appreciative audience in a popular cause. He had been thirteen years at the bar, and had assumed the dignity of serjeant-at-law, when the crisis of his fate arrived.

In the collapse of trade and of national prosperity in general which immediately followed the peace of 1815, the industry of the country was paralysed; the labouring classes, being thrown out of employment, became discontented, and the alarmed Government increased the danger by enacting stringent laws forbidding public meetings and restricting the liberty of the press. A demagogue, known as Dr. Watson, who had collected large masses of people in Spafields, and had occasioned a dangerous riot, was apprehended and brought to trial for high treason, and Serjeant Copley, who was supposed to sympathise with his opinions, was retained for his defence. The speech he made on that occasion, in the Court of King's Bench, Westminster, doubtless saved the prisoner, while it made the fortune of the counsel. Lord Campbell repeats an anecdote which he told us in another form in the *Lives of the Chief Justices* some years ago. It appears that Lord Castle-reagh, the leader of the House of Commons, and one of the most prominent members of the Government, was in the court during the trial. Meeting Jekyll next day, he declared that if Copley had been for the Crown the prosecution would have succeeded, and expressed a wish that he might never be against the Crown again. Jekyll replied, "Bait your rat-trap with Cheshire cheese, and he will soon be caught." The allusion was to the office of Chief Justice of Cheshire, which had been employed before as a bait for rising lawyers of Whiggish proclivities. The jest is probably mythical, but it appears unquestionable that overtures were immediately made on the part of the Government, proposing to give the aspiring serjeant a seat in the House of Commons for a Government borough, with the implied understanding that he should support Government measures, and should receive in due time any legal honours of which he might prove deserving. He was accordingly returned for Yarmouth, in the Isle of Wight, and in the course of the next year was made Chief Justice of Chester.

Having been hitherto known as a "Whig and something more," his sudden conversion to Tory principles excited both wonder and indignation. And if the truth and the whole

truth is on record in the biography, if the opinions of Copley were so extreme in Jacobinism as they are described to have been, and if they continued so down to the date of the negotiation, there was a degree of hardihood on both sides—in the Government in proposing such a change, and in the serjeant in adopting it—which may well astonish us, as it must have astonished those who were then behind the scenes.

From this time the rise of Copley was rapid. He became Solicitor-General in 1819, under Lord Liverpool and Lord Chancellor Eldon. He was engaged in the trial of Thistlewood and his associates in the Cato-street conspiracy—a real and very detestable plot, for which five of them suffered the extreme penalty of the law, being the last persons put to death for high treason in the United Kingdom. He supported the measures of the Government in the House of Commons with great energy and ability, and his biographer cannot resist the temptation to say that “he could have supported with equal zeal measures if possible more obnoxious at the will of the minister,” and to display his own classical lore by comparing him to the mercenary soldier exclaiming,

*Pictore si fratris gladium juguloque parentis*

*Condere si jubeas . . .*

*. . . invita peragam tamen omnia dextra.”*

Reflections, or rather gratuitous assertions, of this nature do not really strengthen the case against Copley, which Lord Campbell is making out through the whole life.

The sternest work of the Solicitor-General, however, was in connection with the question of the divorce of Queen Caroline, which was introduced in Parliament as soon as she returned to England on the death of George III. His speech at the bar of the House of Lords in support of the preamble to the Divorce Bill was so masterly and impressive, that even Brougham was perplexed and discouraged as to the prospects of the defence. The bill was finally withdrawn by the Government, but Copley had succeeded in making a firm friend of one whose friendship was perhaps more useful than honourable—his royal master George IV.

In 1824 he was advanced to the higher dignity of Attorney-General. In this office he employed the great powers given him by the law as it then existed with the utmost moderation. During the two years that he held it, he did not file a single information for libel. His biographer is careful to assure us that this mildness of administration is to be ascribed to the growing influence of the more liberal element in the Cabinet

comprising Canning, Huskisson, and Peel ; in his estimate Copley is still the mercenary soldier. "If he had been directed to file as many criminal informations as Sir Vicary Gibbs, who placed widows and old maids on the floor of the Court of King's Bench to receive sentence for political libels published in newspapers which they had never read, because they received annuities secured on the profits of the newspapers aforesaid, I fear me he would have obeyed, and would have produced very plausible reasons to justify what he did." The great question which at that time agitated the public mind was Catholic Emancipation. Lord Campbell assures us that if Copley had acted according to his secret wishes, he would have promoted the measure, though he found it expedient to vote against it ; but how Copley's secret wishes were ascertained by such an unlikely confidant as himself, Lord Campbell does not inform us. These are samples of the method in which the life of Lyndhurst is recorded. There is, perhaps, enough of political inconsistency and of personal ambition in the career itself. But when we find a great and gifted man denied credit for any good he did, when motives are imputed recklessly, when he is made responsible not only for what he did, but for what his biographer supposes he was prepared to do, we feel ourselves in the position of a jury listening, not to the calm summing up of the case by a judge, but to the wily and unscrupulous address of the counsel for the prosecution, and are inevitably inclined to examine what might be said on the other side.

There is a good story connected with the Attorney-General's practice in Westminster Hall. It is designed to illustrate Copley's character, but may serve also to give us a glance at his biographer. "He was more solicitous about the effect he might produce while speaking, than about the ultimate result of the trial. Therefore, he was unscrupulous in his statement of facts when opening his case to the jury, more particularly when he knew that he was to leave the court at the conclusion of his address, on the plea of attending to public business elsewhere. I was often his junior, and on one of these occasions, when he was stating a triumphant defence, which we had no evidence to prove, I several times plucked him by the gown and tried to check him. Having told the jury that they were bound to find a verdict in his favour, he was leaving the court, but I said, 'No, Mr. Attorney, you must stay and examine the witnesses ; I cannot afford to bear the discredit of losing the verdict from any seeming incompetence ; if you go, I go.' He then very dexterously offered a reference, to

which the other side, taken by his bold opening, very readily assented." The question how far an advocate is justified in misrepresenting facts in the interest of his client, is one of the legal problems which the lay intellect and conscience will not be permitted to decide. It is probable that Copley did no more than his brethren. One real point of the story is the gallant attack which Campbell, driven into a corner, makes upon his formidable leader. How noble that attack would have appeared if it had been made in the interest of truth; how creditable if in the interest of the client; how small and contemptible when proved to be in the interest of poor Campbell himself, unable to afford the discredit of losing the verdict, and unable to see any other way of saving himself.

On the death of Lord Gifford, in 1826, Sir John Copley became Master of the Rolls. In the following session of Parliament he spoke forcibly against Catholic Emancipation, borrowing both facts and arguments, as we are informed, from a very able pamphlet published by Dr. Philpotts, afterwards Bishop of Exeter. On the retirement of Lord Liverpool, after long negotiations, Canning was instructed to form a new administration, and Lord Chancellor Eldon declining to hold office under him, Sir John Copley became Chancellor, and was raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Lyndhurst, of Lyndhurst, in the county of Southampton, in the month of April, 1827.

Henceforth his life is inseparably connected with the political history of his country. We cannot in these pages follow the biographer in tracing his career for upwards of thirty years, during a large portion of which, until the Nestor of the Conservatives\* yielded at last to the infirmities of age, he was among the most prominent members of the House of Lords, and one of the most powerful factors in the political life of the nation. Like other politicians, he had to bear the cold shade of opposition, as well as to bask in the sunshine of office. Like other Tory politicians in an age of progress, he had to reconsider many opinions, and to advocate measures he had formerly opposed. Catholic Emancipation, in particular, had the advantage of being discussed on both sides by his acute intellect, and his unrivalled power in the *genus demonstrativum dicendi*. He was credited with having made the best speech against and the best speech for the Bill for allowing counsel to address the jury in cases of felony. As Peel's Chancellor, at the time of the repeal of the Corn Laws, he was compelled to make a great discovery in political economy. Our author tells us that at the crisis of that question,



being accidentally in the House of Lords, he was beckoned to by Lyndhurst, who said to him in a loud voice, "Campbell, I find the Corn Laws are all a humbug. I used to suppose that the prosperity of our agriculture and of our commerce all depended upon *Protection*, but I tell you *Protection* is a humbug. There is nothing for it now but Free Trade." Of course, Campbell can see no motive for the change but a desire for the sweets of office, and he would probably ascribe no higher motives to Wellington or to Peel. It is to be hoped that posterity will be more merciful.

Though Lyndhurst was four times entrusted with the Great Seal, he is described as a most incompetent Chancellor, hating the duties of his office, and careless about judicial fame. He sat in the Court of Chancery as little as possible, and upon appeals from the Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellors, he almost always affirmed the judgment of the court below. It appears that Lord Cottenham, his predecessor in his last Chancellorship, had precisely the opposite propensity; that in his court the odds were said to be two to one against Vice-Chancellor Shadwell, and three to one against Vice-Chancellor Knight Bruce. But Lyndhurst did sometimes, even in the critical estimate of Lord Campbell, deliver "a very learned and excellent written judgment." So it was in the case of the "*Viscount Canterbury v. the Attorney-General*," when Charles Manners Sutton, the Viscount Canterbury, but formerly Speaker of the House of Commons, sought compensation to the amount of £10,000 for furniture and plate destroyed and damaged in the great fire which consumed the Houses of Parliament. The plea was that the damage occurred in a royal palace, by the negligence of the servants of the Crown, and that the Crown was therefore liable. Lord Lyndhurst, in a judgment very clearly argued, decided against the claim.

Another judgment of his may have appeared to the biographer of very little public interest, but we may be pardoned for regarding it as one of the most important he ever uttered. When Dr. Warren, being a Methodist preacher, and amenable to all the discipline of the Methodist Connexion, appealed to the Court of Chancery against his suspension by the District Committee, the very existence of the Connexion was at stake. No internal government would be possible if its decisions were liable to be reversed and set aside at any moment by a Court of Equity. The question was decided in favour of the legality of the action of the District Committee by Vice-Chancellor Shadwell, and was immediately carried to the Lord

High Chancellor himself. In four days the question was argued before him by some of the most distinguished ornaments of the English bar, and after a day or two's delay, to read the affidavits, Lord Lyndhurst delivered the judgment which established the authority of the ecclesiastical courts of Methodism. Lord Campbell does not mention the case, probably regarding it as one of very ordinary character, in which the decision of the inferior court was almost as a matter of course affirmed. We know that when that judgment was delivered amid the silence of a crowded court, some of our fathers listened with beating hearts, and were ready to regard the faithful magistrate as God's minister for good, saving the church they loved from incalculable difficulties and dangers.

For four years following the overthrow of the Duke of Wellington's Government in 1830, Lord Lyndhurst presided Chief Baron in the Court of Exchequer. The post was offered by Earl Grey, the new Prime Minister, to the retiring Chancellor. Lord Campbell says that the temptation which induced him to accept it was the salary of £7,000 a year; "for although he could contrive to prevent executions being put into his house, he was exceedingly poor, and the retired allowance for Chancellor was then only £4,000 a year—an income quite insufficient to support Lady Lyndhurst's fashionable establishment." Lyndhurst's poverty appears to be a pleasant subject to his biographer. In one place he mentions a rumour that at some of his magnificent entertainments "the band of attendants at table was swelled by sheriff's officers put into livery," and then generously assures us that there was no sufficient foundation for the rumour. In another place, alluding to his mortification at having no son to inherit his title, he informs us that if the peerage had been transmitted it would have been poorly endowed, as, although relieved from pecuniary embarrassment, he was only able to live comfortably on his retired allowance as ex-Chancellor, and to make a decent provision for his daughters.

Of the Chief Baron we have much the same account as of the Chancellor. He might, if he had liked, have earned the highest reputation for judicial excellence; but he would not give his mind to judicial business, and consequently his opinion was, and is, of small weight in Westminster Hall. In the great case of "*Small v. Attwood*," arising out of a contract for the sale of iron mines, he delivered a judgment described as the most wonderful ever heard in Westminster Hall. "He employed a long day in stating complicated facts, in entering into complex calculations, and in correcting the misrepresen-

tations of counsel on both sides. Never once did he falter or hesitate, and never once was he mistaken in a name, a figure, or a date." Nevertheless, on appeal to the House of Lords, it was held that he had come to a wrong conclusion on the merits, and the judgment was reversed.

Whether in or out of office, Lord Lyndhurst was always mighty in the House of Lords. His oratory, if comparatively devoid of fancy, and seldom rising into impassioned eloquence, yet, unrivalled in argumentative and convincing power, was peculiarly adapted to impress the members of the hereditary branch of the British Legislature. There are some instances of the manner in which this power was used which indicate clearly enough the unscrupulous partisan; but evidence is not wanting that such a mode of warfare was not confined to one party. An amusing account is given of a debate arising on one of his reviews of the session during the Melbourne Ministry. He went over the various measures recommended in the King's speech, and showed that, notwithstanding his own desire to support them as far as he conscientiously could, they had either miscarried entirely, or been considerably altered before they were adopted, and he concludes thus:—

"In former times, my lords, amid such defeats and disasters, and unable to carry those measures which he considered essential and necessary, a minister would have thought that he had only one course to pursue. These are antiquated notions—everything has changed. This fastidious delicacy forms no part of the character of the noble Viscount. He has told us, and his acts correspond with his assertions—that notwithstanding the insubordination which prevails around him, in spite of the sullen and mutinous temper of his crew, he will stick to the vessel while a single plank remains afloat. Let me, however, as a friendly adviser of the noble Viscount, recommend him to get her as speedily as possible into still water.

Fortiter occupa  
Portum.

Let the noble Viscount look to the empty benches around him.

. . . Nonne vides, ut  
Nudum remigio latus,  
. . . ac sine funibus  
Vix durare carino  
Possint imperiosius  
Sequor.

After all, there is something in the efforts and exertions of the noble Viscount not altogether unamusing. It is impossible, under any circumstances, not to respect

A brave man struggling in the storms of fate.

May a part, at least, of what follows be averted—

And greatly falling with a falling state.

My consolation is, that whatever be the disposition\* of the noble Viscount, he has not sufficient strength, though his locks, I believe, are yet unshorn, to pull down the pillars of the building and involve the whole in his ruin. I trust it will long survive his fall."

He closed his speech, amid the merriment of the House, by moving for "a return of the public bills which have been introduced into Parliament during the present session, with the dates of their being rejected or abandoned, or receiving the royal assent." Lord Melbourne replied in a speech considered to be the best he ever delivered, went through the bills which Lyndhurst had defeated, showing that several of them had been supported by the Conservatives in the other House, and thus concluded:—

"The noble and learned lord kindly advises me to resign, notwithstanding his own great horror of taking office, after his ambition is already so fully satisfied. But I will tell the noble and learned lord that I will not be accessory to the sacrifice of himself, which he would be ready to make if the duties of the Great Seal were again forced upon him. I conscientiously believe that the well-being of the country requires that I should hold my present office—and hold it I will—till I am constitutionally removed from it."

The debate being ended, Lyndhurst went over to Lord Melbourne, and "they laughed and joked together, both pleased with themselves, thinking that in this rencontre each had tilted to the admiration of the bystanders."

On the resignation of Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, Lord Lyndhurst, then in the 74th year of his age, bade a final farewell to the Great Seal. On the evening of the very day in which it was transferred to Lord Cottenham, a great banquet was given by the Benchers of the Inner Temple; and Lords Lyndhurst, Brougham, and Campbell all went together in Lady Lyndhurst's carriage. They passed a very pleasant evening, but the most memorable thing that was said was a hit of Brougham's at the biographer of the Chancellors. He was speaking in high terms of Lyndhurst, and wishing him a happy evening to his honoured wife, "though to an expiring Chancellor death was now armed with a new terror." Brougham was aware that neither Lyndhurst nor himself would meet with mercy at Campbell's hands. At the same time he knew that history would do them justice.

For this we have to wait in the case of Lyndhurst. Lord Campbell's book will not fix the place he is to hold in the estimate of our posterity. In a review of the *Lives of the Chief Justices* in the pages of this Journal, some twelve years ago, allusion is made to the evident animosity of the writer against Lyndhurst, then living and formidable. It is evident that when this biography was written, the scars of the old wounds were smarting at the memory of battles long ago. Lord Campbell has not been able to attain the impartiality of history. He colours facts, he imputes motives, he suggests intentions. And we cannot afford to think so ill of Lyndhurst as he would teach us. If he was indeed the unprincipled adventurer he is described to have been, what must be thought of the moral atmosphere in which he flourished, and of the character of the country itself where he so long enjoyed "all that should accompany old age, as honour, love, obedience, troops of friends"? History will do him justice. This book, as we have already said, is the *ex-parte* statement of the counsel for the prosecution.

The life of Brougham is not recorded in the same spirit of unwearied hostility as that of Lyndhurst, and therefore affords far greater pleasure to the reader. Lord Campbell says, and no doubt sincerely, "I still feel not only regret, but something savouring of remorse, when I am obliged, as a faithful biographer, to record anything which may seem not altogether to the credit of one with whom I have spent so many pleasant hours." He has, however, struggled against these generous feelings with considerable success. He does not think very much of any of Brougham's great achievements, and he has taken care that no slip, no oddity, no extravagance shall be forgotten. Shakespeare makes Brutus say, in his oration over the body of the murdered Cæsar, "His glory not extenuated, wherein he was worthy, nor his offences enforced, for which he suffered death." We cannot say so much of this biography.

It is a little unfair to charge upon Brougham the blunders of former biographers, as though he had designed to wrap in obscurity the date and the place of his birth; but Lord Campbell evidently could not resist the temptation to quote the couplet about the seven cities disputing for the honour of being the birthplace of Homer. He shows that he was born in Edinburgh on the 19th of September, 1778. We fear that there is better foundation for the charge of exaggerating any claims he may have had to noble ancestry; but Lord Campbell has spent more labour on the subject than it

was worth; and though he is never wearied of the jest against his friend, he contrives to weary his reader.

Henry Brougham was the son of a gentleman of small independent fortune in Westmoreland, who went into Scotland with the intention of making a brief tour of pleasure, was fascinated by a beautiful Scotch lassie, and on his marriage made Edinburgh his home, where he lived a quiet literary life. His grandfather, on the other hand, was a bustling attorney, steward to the Duke of Norfolk, and very actively engaged in the politics of London during the disputes between Wilkes and the House of Commons. The theory of the hereditary transmission of intellectual powers and propensities might find some illustration here. But Brougham himself always traced his mental pedigree to his mother, a niece of the celebrated Dr. Robertson, and a woman of very superior character. He always showed her the most affectionate respect during her long widowhood, and she evinced her correct appreciation of his character by her remark when he was made Lord High Chancellor, and raised to the peerage. "It would have suited our Henry better to have continued member for the county of York, and a leader of the Liberals in the House of Commons."

Brougham's infancy seems to have been almost as precocious as that of King Richard III., and to have given similar promise of a stormy career. His first scholastic training was at the High School of Edinburgh, where he is reported to have played a trick upon the second master, by writing Latin which appeared bold and barbarous, suffering the discipline of the "taws" accordingly, and presenting himself next day with a load of books, prepared to vindicate the castigated Latinity out of the classics of the Augustan age. He is reported to have been met on one of the bridges in Edinburgh at about twelve years of age, with a huge quarto under his arm, which proved to be a volume of *La Place* in the original. The classical training of the High School was not sufficient to occupy his vigorous mind, and the study of obtuse mathematics in a foreign language, for his own amusement, was characteristic of the man who "sought out and intermeddled with all knowledge."

At fourteen years of age, he entered the University of Edinburgh, and at eighteen, the age when a youth educated in England would be thinking of entering at Oxford or Cambridge, he had finished the ordinary curriculum. Campbell boasts of Brougham as an instance of the success of the Scotch system of education, which attempts a far wider



range of study than ours, and which provides systematic instruction in every branch. He assures us that when Brougham left the University, "he had acquired a store of information, which, if not always profound and exact, was prodigiously extensive, and over which, with the assistance of a powerful memory, he ever had a powerful command; insomuch, that if shut up in a tower without books, at the end of a year he would have produced (barring a few ludicrous blunders) a very tolerable encyclopædia." At an English University, such a result would probably not have been attained; but his acute mathematical intellect would have received a severe training, his classical learning would have gone far beyond the point necessary to enable him to translate respectably an oration of Demosthenes, and his mind might have been disciplined into what perhaps it wanted most, the habit of precision and accuracy. Edinburgh made him a "full man," and nature had made him a "ready man," but the work of an English University would have been to make him an "exact man."

His papers on *Light*, sent to the Royal Society of London, in his nineteenth and twentieth years, and on *Prisms*, sent to the same learned society in the year following, proved nothing so much as the daring of his ambition. They did not enlarge the bounds of human knowledge, nor exalt their author to a position of rivalry to Sir Isaac Newton. He appears to have put forth all his strength in debating societies, and especially in that nursery of great men, the "Speculative Society." While winning there the reputation of being the most powerful debater that had yet appeared on that arena, he had not outgrown the frolics of youth. We have stories of twisting off door-knockers, and of smashing lamps, of taking the lead in his "deep damnation" of a poor play, of riding to the races in a sedan-chair, after wagering that no member of a company would name the conveyance, which seem strange as being recorded by one Lord Chancellor of England concerning another, and which many youths of nineteen or twenty would find it easier to imitate than even the paper on *Prisms*.

In the year 1800, having passed the requisite examinations, he was called to the Scotch bar. He signalised his entrance on his first circuit by breaking through the judge's procession in a one-horse chaise; and, having escaped committal for "contempt," he proceeded to amuse himself and to torment the judge by the unexpected pleas he presented on behalf of his clients. A man charged with stealing a pair of boots, was

defended on the ground that they were not boots, but half-boots, "and half-boots are not boots, any more than half a guinea is a guinea." Lord Eckgrove overruled the objection, laying it down as law, that "the moon is always the moon, although sometimes she is the half-moon." Returning to Edinburgh, Brougham spent some months upon his book on *The Colonial Policy of the European Nations*, which, to his biographer's wonder, avows no party politics; of course, Campbell supposes that he had not yet decided whether it would be more profitable to take the Tory side or the Whig, but those who are accustomed to judge more charitably of motives, may conjecture that he regarded these great questions of the wealth of nations as rising above the region of party politics.

The great event of this period, however, was the establishment of the *Edinburgh Review*. The story has been often told of the meeting of half-a-dozen young men in Jeffrey's residence in the ninth storey; and it is curious to remark how varied are the versions of it, published on the authority of men equally well-informed, and all incapable of misrepresentation. Sydney Smith says, "I was appointed editor, and remained long enough in Edinburgh to edit the first number of the *Edinburgh Review*." But Jeffrey says, in what, we are sorry to see, Campbell calls a "pretended letter" to Mr. Chambers, that for the first three numbers there was "no individual editor;" he says also, that Brougham was not admitted till after the publication of the third number. Campbell, on the authority of Murray, who was also one of the original band, gives the titles of three papers from Brougham's hand, which actually appeared in the first number. In all probability Lord Campbell's information is correct, and Jeffrey's memory was at fault; but the character of Mr. Robert Chambers should have protected him from such an imputation as that of forging a letter. The document in question (for it is not described as a letter) appeared in the *Life of Lord Jeffrey*, published in 1850, in *Chambers's Papers for the People*, and probably nobody ever thought of doubting its genuineness but Lord Campbell.

The contributions of Brougham to the *Review* were almost countless, and ranged over all classes of subjects. He slashed the young Lord Byron's first attempts so fiercely, that he sprang at once to his full stature as a poet, and proved that there was that in him which it would have needed superhuman insight to detect in the *Hours of Idleness*. He postponed the fair discussion of the Undulatory Theory of

Light by his reckless criticism of Professor Young. A story is told, on the authority of Lord Cockburn, to the effect, that being in want of money, he wrote to Jeffrey for £1,000, which was repaid in the course of six weeks in articles for the *Review*.

In the meantime, Brougham had removed to London, had obtained the *entrée* of Holland House, and the friendship of Wilberforce; and, in November, 1808, had been called to the English bar. He gained at first but little success on circuit, and when he appeared at the bar of the House of Lords to prosecute a Scotch appeal case, Lord Chancellor Eldon annoyed him by repeatedly, and perhaps designedly, mispronouncing his name—calling him Mr. *Bruffam*. It appears that the name should be pronounced in one syllable, not *Bruff-am*, nor even *Bro-am*, but *Broom*; and the Lord Chancellor having been set right upon the matter, remarked at the conclusion of the young counsel's exhaustive argument, "Every authority upon the question has been brought before us; new *Brooms* sweep clean."

His first great opportunity was afforded by his being retained as counsel to the petitioners to both Houses of Parliament against the Orders in Council. The subject was one for which his previous studies had amply prepared him, and his masterly eloquence attracted multitudes to hear the discussion of the principles of political economy. He lost his cause, but he gained his reputation; and two years afterwards, on the elevation of his college friend, Lord Henry Petty, to the House of Lords, he was returned to Parliament for the borough of Camelford.

During the two years which preceded the dissolution of Parliament in 1812, Brougham accomplished two most important objects; he succeeded in passing a Bill by which the Slave Trade was pronounced to be felony; and in securing the repeal of the obnoxious Orders in Council. If he had never done anything else, his name would be remembered as that of one who deserved well of his country. During the progress of the latter question, while Mr. Brougham was examining a witness before the House of Commons, a pistol shot was heard, which in another moment was announced to have been the death-knell of Mr. Perceval, the Prime Minister. The House adjourned, but the opponents of the Orders in Council did not relax their exertions, and one powerful speech of Brougham's completed their victory. A brief extract from that speech may serve to illustrate the manner in which the most advanced British statesman then spoke of the United States of America, with which we were just drifting into war.

"Jealousy of America! I should as soon think of being jealous of the tradesmen who supply me with necessaries, or the clients who entrust their suits to my patronage. Jealousy of America! whose armies are still at the plough, or making, since your policy has willed it so, awkward (though improving) attempts at the loom—whose navies could not lay siege to an English sloop of war. Jealousy of a Power which is necessarily peaceful as well as weak, but which, if it had the ambition of France and her armies to back it, and all the navy of England to boot, nay, had it the lust of conquest which marks your enemy, and your own armies as well as navy to gratify it, is placed at so vast a distance as to be perfectly harmless!"

The object of Brougham was to persuade the House of Commons that it was consistent with their dignity to conciliate America; but it may be questioned whether the report of his speech would not exasperate the citizens of the Republic as much as the withdrawal of the Orders in Council would gratify them.

The dissolution of Parliament in 1812 excluded Brougham from the representation of Camelford. He attempted to secure a seat for Liverpool, and afterwards for the Inverkeithing boroughs, but was defeated, and shut out of the House for four years. He continued to practise as a barrister, gaining his chief renown in what was called the "sedition line"—defending the Hunts successfully when charged with libel against the Government, and unsuccessfully when charged with libel against the Regent himself, but always with equal skill and audacity. In the general practice of his profession, he is said never to have equalled some of his rivals at the bar, of whom posterity will scarcely hear.

In 1816, he was again returned to Parliament, and henceforth was never without a seat in the Lower House until, fourteen years afterwards, he left it for the Woolsack. He was indebted successively to the Earl of Darlington and to the Duke of Devonshire for boroughs under their influence. Strange as it may appear, although he made two attempts on Westmoreland, he never succeeded in winning a seat for a popular constituency until, in 1830, he was returned for the county of York.

On the death of George III., in 1820, Caroline of Brunswick, the detested wife of the Prince Regent, became Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. Married many years before to a man who paid no respect in his own conduct to any moral obligation, and who treated her with the grossest neglect and contumely, she had been driven into questionable society in this country, and finally into a prolonged residence abroad.

The question of her guilt or innocence can never be settled now, but it is unquestionable that multitudes were prepared, by hatred of the husband, to believe in the purity of the wife. As Princess of Wales, she could only claim her decent maintenance; but as Queen Consort, she had a position recognised by the Constitution of the realm, which she was resolved at all hazards to assert. She prepared to return to England, and in the exercise of her legal prerogative, she appointed Henry Brougham her Attorney General. Perhaps no Queen Consort since the days of Henry VIII. had more urgent need of one, and certainly none was ever better served.

Negotiations were set on foot, with the object of inducing her to remain abroad, and thus to avoid the scandal of an open rupture. The conduct of Brougham in these negotiations has never been satisfactorily explained; but the point on which they failed, the demand that she should never assume any title belonging to the Royal Family, was one on which compromise on her part was impossible without acknowledgment of guilt. She therefore came to London, and the conflict began. The King's Government introduced a bill into the House of Lords for her deposition and divorce on the ground of adultery, and a host of witnesses were brought over from the Continent to support the charge. The crisis was one for which the peculiar temperament of Brougham fully qualified him. By his scathing cross-examination he annihilated the miserable Italian witnesses, and made their stammering "*non mi ricordo*" a proverb in England for ever. By his fearless denunciation of the royal prosecutor, and by the terrible energy of his eloquence, he aroused the popular feeling on behalf of his client to a degree of passion that was dangerous to the Throne itself. The close of his final oration, said to have been re-written seventeen times, is a master-piece of its own class:—

"Such, my lords, is the case before you. Such is the evidence in support of this measure—evidence inadequate to prove a debt—impotent to deprive of a civil right, ridiculous to convict of the lowest offence, scandalous if brought forward to support a charge of the highest nature which the law knows, monstrous to ruin the honour, to blast the name of an English Queen. What shall I say, then, if this is the proof by which an act of judicial legislation, a parliamentary sentence, an *ex post facto* law, is sought to be passed against this defenceless woman? My lords, I pray you to pause. I do earnestly beseech you to take heed! You are standing on the brink of a precipice—then beware! It will go forth your judgment, if sentence should go against the Queen. But it will be the only

judgment you ever pronounced which, instead of reaching its object, will return and bound back upon those who give it. Save the country, my lords, from the horrors of this catastrophe—save yourselves from this peril—rescue that country, of which you are the ornaments, but in which you can flourish no longer, when severed from the people, than the blossom when cut off from the roots and the stem of the tree. Save that country, that you may continue to adorn it; save the Crown, which is in jeopardy; the aristocracy, which is shaken; save the altar, which must stagger with the blow that rends its kindred throne. You have said, my lords, you have willed—the Church and the King have willed—that the Queen should be deprived of its solemn service. She has, instead of that solemnity, the heartfelt prayers of the people. She wants no prayers of mine. But I do here pour forth my humble supplications at the Throne of Mercy, that mercy may be poured down upon the people, in a larger measure than the merits of its rulers may deserve, and that your hearts may be turned to justice.”

The bill was finally withdrawn, after its discussion had scandalised Europe, had shaken the basis of the English monarchy, and had elevated Brougham as an advocate to a higher rank than any man beside had ever attained in this country. The Queen did not long enjoy her triumph; she was repulsed from Westminster Abbey at the coronation of her husband, and her mortification is supposed to have induced the disease which shortly afterwards terminated in death.

In 1823 a painful scene occurred in the House of Commons between Canning and Brougham. The latter accused the former of “monstrous truckling,” in reference to Catholic emancipation, “for the sake of obtaining office;” and Canning being fiery and Brougham obstinate, there appeared some probability of their both being committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. The explanation of Brougham was, however, at the suggestion of Peel, accepted by Canning—Peel having assured the House that the facts must have been grossly misrepresented, “for nothing could be more free from truckling than the manner in which his right honourable friend had accepted office.” Campbell cannot let slip the opportunity of saying that Peel—then the anti-Catholic leader—was not sorry to see his rival damaged; while on the contrary it would seem that Peel was the very man whose peculiar position enabled him to interpose in the difficulty, and that he did interpose in the very best way. But indeed Campbell is unwilling that we should admire Sir Robert Peel; he says he could not manage the letter *h*, at least in the



middle of a word, but would say, "The man be'aves well who ad'eres to his friends."

Slavery, education, public charities, and law reform were at this time the subjects which principally engaged the unwearied energies of Brougham. Lord Liverpool died suddenly, and Canning having, after long intrigues, become Prime Minister, was supported by the Whigs in general, and especially by Brougham, whom Campbell describes, in language more graphic than elegant, as crossing the House, sitting down behind him, and sticking his knees into the back of his former opponent. In a few months Canning died also, worn out by the cares and conflicts for which his nature was too finely strung, and too sensitive. Lord Goderich assumed the reins of government, and flung them down again without waiting for the meeting of Parliament; and the Duke of Wellington, whom Campbell pronounces destitute of "civil wisdom," formed a Tory administration, which emancipated the Roman Catholics and repealed the Test and Corporation Acts, and set the example which Tory Governments of later days have known how to follow.

On the death of George IV., in 1830, and the consequent dissolution of Parliament, the tranquillity of the country was suddenly interrupted by the tidings of the French Revolution, which overthrew the throne of Charles X. All at once arose an agitation over the whole country for Parliamentary Reform, and the Liberal party selected Henry Brougham to contest the great county of York. His exertions are described as unparalleled. The assizes were going on at York, and he was fully engaged; nevertheless, he found time to address public meetings in every town and large village within the county. And being regarded as the champion of the great changes on which the heart of the nation was set, and favoured by the revolutionary excitement of the times, he gained his election, and returned to London with the prestige of having been chosen, on the ground of his personal merits alone, as the representative of the greatest constituency in the empire.

The Wellington Government fell by a hostile vote upon the Civil List, before the great battle of Reform began. The Whig Ministry, which followed it, was not constructed without difficulty and delay. Brougham had never been a docile party politician, and the party leaders rather feared than loved him, and would gladly have dispensed with his services, but he was far too formidable a power in the House and in the country to be left unnoticed. In his speeches in Yorkshire, he had declared his resolution not to accept office. He was asked

to join the Government as Attorney-General, and rejected the offer with scorn. In the House, he ostentatiously proclaimed his freedom from all party ties, promising to support the new Government "*in so far as he conscientiously could.*" He had given notice of a motion on Parliamentary Reform, which Lord Althorp, the recognised leader of the Whigs in the House of Commons, requested him to postpone on the ground of the existing ministerial crisis. In his reply he avowed the greatest possible unwillingness to postpone the motion, and closed thus :—

"And further, as no change that may take place in the administration can by any possibility affect me, I beg it to be understood, that in putting off the motion, I will put it off until the 25th of this month, and no longer. I will then, and at no more distant period, bring forward the question of Parliamentary Reform, whatever may be the then state of affairs, and whosoever may then be his Majesty's ministers."

Lord Campbell says—

"At the distance of a quarter of a century, I retain a lively recollection of the sensation which this scene produced. He concluded his speech in a low and hollow voice, indicating suppressed wrath and purposed vengeance. The bravest held their breath for a time, and in the long pauses which he allowed to intervene between his sentences, a feather might have been heard to drop."

It became manifest, that however difficult it might be to act with Brougham in the Cabinet, it would be impracticable to get on without him; he was urgently requested to join the Government on his own terms; and, for once, even Lord Campbell does not impute any unworthy motives for his departure from his avowed intentions. He was therefore appointed Lord Chancellor, on Monday, the 22nd of November, 1830, and on the following day was elevated to the peerage, with the title of Lord Brougham and Vaux.

In the struggle of Reform which followed, no part was more prominent than his. There is a graphic description of the close of his great speech on the second reading of the Bill. This peroration "was partly inspired by draughts of mulled port imbibed by him very copiously towards the conclusion of the four hours during which he was on his legs, or on his knees."

"Rouse not, I beseech you, a peace-loving, but a resolute people; do not alienate from your body the affections of a whole empire. As your friend, as the friend of my order, as the friend of my country, as the faithful servant of my sovereign, I counsel you to assist with

your uttermost efforts in preserving the peace, and upholding and perpetuating the Constitution. Therefore, I pray and exhort you not to reject this measure. By all you hold most dear—by all the ties that bind every one of us to our common order and our common country, I solemnly adjure you—I warn you—I implore you—yea, on my bended knees (*he kneels*) I supplicate you—reject not this Bill.’

“He continued some time, as if in prayer; but his friends, alarmed for him lest he should be suffering from the effects of the mulled port, picked him up and placed him safely on the woolsack.”

The House of Lords proving unmanageable, a proposal was made to swamp the Opposition by the creation of fifty new peers; and, under the threat of this coercion, the Tory peers absented themselves, and allowed the Bill to pass.

Brougham was at this time at the zenith of his political power, and of his personal influence. He was the first man in the country, and had his prudence been equal to his genius, he might have continued so through all the long period of Whig supremacy that followed.

Here we must leave the details of the biography. History has recorded how he excited the jealousy of his colleagues, the distrust of his party, and the displeasure of the King; until at length, on the return of the Whigs to office, after a brief exclusion, they ventured to dispense with his services as Chancellor; and how from that time he pursued an independent course, verging more and more towards Conservatism in politics, but devoting his greatest energies to the promotion of those great practical reforms which he accounted the most important work of legislation.

It is almost needless for us to say that, in our estimate, Campbell has failed to appreciate Brougham. He carps at his law, he jokes at his science, he triumphs at the unsaleableness of some of his literary productions, and evidently is of opinion that on the whole John Campbell is much the greater and the more honest man. But, in trying to set Brougham at his true level, Campbell has effectually condemned and exhibited himself.

---

ART. VIII.—*A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble.* By Sir J. T. COLERIDGE, D.C.L. James Parker & Co., London and Oxford. 1869.

In the fifty-second number of this Journal\* we gave an article to the life, character, and poetry of John Keble, who died three months before the publication of the article. Our sketch of his life was founded on several communications of considerable length from the pen of Sir J. T. Coleridge, which appeared in the *Guardian* newspaper during the month of April preceding. The outline we gave was so far complete, and, in particular, our observations upon the mutual relations by which Keble, Newman, and Hurrell Froude were connected together, and upon the exact position in which Keble stood to the Tractarian movement, dealt so fully with the points involved, that now, upon the publication of Sir John T. Coleridge's life of his friend, we find our task as reviewers somewhat lighter than it would otherwise have been.

Sir John Coleridge and Mr. Keble had been friends for fifty-five years, throughout the whole of which period their personal intercourse had been frequent, their correspondence unbroken, and their mutual affection and confidence unchilled by anything like misunderstanding or reserve. It is impossible, therefore, to conceive of anyone undertaking, with more complete knowledge and sympathy, to write the life of a friend. Jonathan loved David "as his own soul." Such was the love which the eminent and accomplished judge bore to his friend. In 1809, at Corpus Christi College, the friendship began; in 1810, friendship had become intimacy; in 1811, the correspondence began, which was never intermitted until Keble's death in 1866. In 1809, Keble was seventeen, and Coleridge nineteen. Very rare indeed are such instances of long-continued brotherly friendship in this world of change, mischance, and death. What makes the instance yet more rare is, that both friends retained throughout, not only their love but their faculties unimpaired. Indeed, there can hardly be a doubt that both the friends lived in a purer and higher intellectual and moral atmosphere year by year, at least during the last twenty years of their fellowship here. And, although the surviving friend is now in his

---

\* July, 1866.

seventy-ninth year, his intellect seems to be as clear, and his judgment as sure and unclouded as ever.

Nevertheless, we confess to some disappointment in rising from the reading of this volume. Sir John has hardly set his friend before our view. It seems as if reverence and delicacy had prevented him from tracing, with the clear, firm hand which a judicial and complete biography demands, the features of his friend's character. The truth is honestly told, as point after point comes into view; but not a few points of peculiar interest in the character and course of Mr. Keble scarcely come at all into view in this memoir. And, throughout, there is no attempt to furnish a complete picture of the man. Keble's was a character by no means easy to understand. He was a poet and a theologian, but appears to have been quite devoid of speculative power; he was a recluse, and yet a controversialist; tender, and yet austere; loving, but very narrow; more advanced in his Romanising, as *we* call it, in Catholic doctrine, as *he* would have phrased it, than Newman was at the time he went over to Rome, than Pusey has ever been; and yet not only did he never go over himself, but he escaped, almost entirely, the obloquy and animosity which followed his two friends: narrow, severe, bigoted, as we shall presently find that he was in his aspect, not only towards "Puritans" and Dissenters, but towards all in his own Church who claimed the right of believing or feeling any otherwise than as he conceived that Church to have prescribed, or of fraternising with any Christians outside of the hierarchical pale of the "Catholic" communions, he was yet in his ordinary deportment, very humble and peculiarly winning, and so passed through life that the public of all denominations, biassed, no doubt, largely by the style and character of the *Christian Year*, would have judged severity to have been an attribute incompatible with his temper and character, and narrowness in him to have been nothing more than the limitation imposed by a rigid creed, which his largeness and lovingness of spirit would relax and mitigate to the utmost. Such a character as this, so complex, and at points apparently so contradictory, claimed so much from the biographer as to be analysed, and, if possible, harmonised. If anyone could have furnished the key to its intricacies, the friend of fifty-five years could have done so. Indeed, it is plain enough that Sir John thoroughly knew his friend; our complaint is, that he has not expounded to his readers the full meaning of a character with the peculiarities of which he was himself so familiar. As we read his pages, a trait comes

out here, and another there, often faintly and waveringly; but the moral and meaning of his whole character and course are imperfectly rendered, while in no part have we furnished to us a portrait of the man himself.

This deficiency is felt especially in regard to the ecclesiastical course and relations of Mr. Keble. Newman, in his *Apologia*, represents Keble as being, in a sort, the very father of the Tractarian movement, and it is certain, it is indeed evident from this volume, that he was, throughout, the counsellor and trusted friend of the leading members of the ultra High Church party. We might fairly have expected, accordingly, in the *Life of Keble*, to have some important addition made to our knowledge of the history of the "movement." Newman, in his book, had frankly told us much, to the help of charity and the increase of our knowledge—on the whole, as we think, to the advantage of all parties. If Keble's *Life* had told us but half as much more, the public would have been grateful.

Keble's correspondence with Pusey and Newman is what, in his biography, all must have expected to furnish one of its most interesting and most valuable features. Of this there is nothing whatever.

"I must say a particular word," the biographer explains, "as to one, perhaps his dearest and most honoured friend, who will be in every one's mind—Dr. Pusey. I suppose he possesses large numbers of important and interesting letters. He has always been so kind to me, that I should be ungrateful if I doubted his readiness to help me—indeed, to volunteer his help, wherever he felt he could do so properly. Yet it is obvious that from the very intimacy which subsisted between them, combined with the extreme delicacy of the subjects to which their correspondence must have principally related, his letters might be just such as he would think it improper as yet to make public. I have therefore never applied to him: and for reasons not exactly the same, but of the same kind, I have pursued the same course with Dr. Newman.

"The work no doubt suffers in consequence."—*Preface*, p. ix.

The work *does* suffer inestimably.

However, we must take it as it is, and, after all abatements are made, it remains an interesting and instructive memoir. Its chief value consists in the extracts which are given from Keble's letters to the biographer. Having, from motives of delicacy, precluded himself from using such other sources of special interest as those to which we have referred, Sir John had no alternative—although his modesty revolted—but to draw largely from this source.



"I find now," he says, in his preface, "that in the beginning I had hardly realised the extent to which this would go; and yet as I advanced, I knew not how to avoid it. I could not think it right to alter his expressions, perfectly sincere as I knew them to be, though certainly exaggerated. The truth is, he was so humble, and at the same time so loving to his friends, that it seemed as if in his mind all the weakness and imperfection were in himself, all the strength and goodness in them. His letters must be read with this thought in the mind of the reader."—P. viii.

We have complained of one deficiency in the representation here given of Keble, that we catch but scattered glimpses of his character, but have not anywhere a clear, full view of it. No doubt if the biography had been given in larger detail, and especially if Keble's correspondence on critical questions of faith and policy had been adequately drawn upon, the biographer's own portraiture and exposition might well have been spared, because the thoughts and faculties, the principles and purposes, of the subject of the memoir would have revealed themselves in the play of his heart and mind. As it is, a reverent delicacy, as we have already intimated, has laid a check upon the biographer. To which it must be added that illness has supervened, and has added the burden of special weakness to the hesitation and shrinking naturally felt by such a friend in dealing critically with the life and memory of a man like Keble, when viewed in his relations to painful and perilous controversies which, beginning thirty years ago, are yet in full force, and, if abated in virulence, have grown visibly wider and more momentous in their scope and sweep.

"When I undertook my task," says Sir John, "some of my best friends doubted whether I had still strength of body or mind sufficient for it. Beginning it with perhaps too much eagerness and anxiety, it was not long before I was stopped by an illness, some effects of which have never wholly left me—one of them has been the inability, sometimes, to work at all—and always to do so for more than a short period of time from day to day."—*Preface*, p. vii.

If we remember that the biographer is verging close upon his eightieth year, and allow due force to the considerations which have now been stated, we shall feel that we have no right to complain that *he* has not done more; the wonder is, that he has had heart and mind and will enough to do so much. The *ἦθος* of the volume, we need hardly say, is admirable; the tone, the temper, the judgment displayed in it are perfect; and, although we have by no means the ideal life of

Keble, whether as poet, divine, or ecclesiastical leader and partisan, *for partisan he was*, we have a valuable sketch, drawn from the best sources—altogether fresh and authentic—from which a good deal may be learnt, both as to the man and as to the course of ecclesiastical affairs during more than one generation past. “Fully, delicately, faithfully, lovingly”—so we are told by the biographer, that he himself felt the life ought to be written, and “delicately, faithfully, lovingly,” but not “fully,” he has written it. “When I consented to the request made to me,” he says, “I felt that I was not in any way competent to write the history of our Church for the last forty years, which yet seemed a necessary part of any complete account of his work on earth.”\* Even so, and therefore, as he adds, “Many readers will be disappointed.”

Keble was born in 1792, on St. Mark's Day (the biographer throughout keeps to the High Church Puritanical style in dating by the Church calendar), at Fairford, in Gloucestershire. His father, who lived to his ninetieth year, was Vicar of Coln, St. Aldwins, but lived in his own house at Fairford, three miles distant. His mother's name was Maule, and her father was Incumbent of Ringwood, Hants. Thus, on both sides, he came of a pastoral stock, and it may here be noted that his only and still surviving brother Thomas, like himself, became a clergyman (Rector of Bisley), that that brother's son also took orders, and that Mr. Keble himself, like his father, married a clergyman's daughter, by whom, however, he had no family.

The brothers were taught at home by their father, and John was distinguished by his godfather, Mr. Stafford Smith, another clergyman (Rector of Fladbury), as John the Good. Nevertheless, his habits through life, although he was never idle, were those of a desultory student, and the tradition was that his father left him to study much as he pleased. However this may be, young Keble obtained a scholarship at Corpus Christi, of which college his father had been Scholar and Fellow, at a very early age—when he yet wanted more than four months of completing his fifteenth year. This was in December, 1806. It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Keble, senior, had not only himself been a Scholar and Fellow of Corpus, but had “maintained personal relations with the governing members of the house.” This, no doubt, was in young Keble's favour. Still, whatever may have been due to these considerations, his election at so early an age was remarkable.

---

\* P. 2.

Keble began his classical studies with "a play of Euripides, which, however," he says in writing to his sister, "I have before read." "Many of his letters to his sisters and brothers, written soon after the commencement of his academic life, have been preserved; they are the simple outpouring of an affectionate, home-loving, and clever boy, with a great deal, moreover, of that joyous fun and humour, which he never entirely lost even in the most anxious years of his life."

In April, 1809, Coleridge himself was elected a scholar of Corpus, being Keble's senior by two years. Keble was now in his third year, "highly distinguished in the senior classes of the college, both in classics and mathematics." Coleridge was "soon upon terms of familiarity with Keble, which rapidly ripened into friendship." They lived on the same staircase, he in a garret over Coleridge's rooms.

In 1811 Thomas Arnold, coming from Winchester, was elected scholar of Corpus. Coleridge, Arnold, and Keble became intimate friends, and the threefold cord was unbroken for more than twenty years. At length, however, the divergency of their respective views, which both held warmly and as a part of their religion, separated between Arnold and Keble. Their common friend speaks sadly of "the unhappy interruption" of their "intimate intercourse," and adds, "to both it was a bitter trial, and I am sure that in neither did it extinguish the tenderest love for the other."

At Corpus, Keble made some other close and warm friendships. One was John Miller, Bampton Lecturer in 1817, and author of a volume of sermons (1830). Bishop Jebb and Keble speak in the highest terms of the Lectures, and Southey more than once very strongly commends the Sermons.\* He died in 1858. Another was George James Cornish, a true and noble man, a poet also, as well as a divine, whose charming lines on the Redbreast, Keble has, in his *Christian Year*, appended to his stanzas on the *Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity*. The third was Charles Dyson, a man unquestionably of rare excellences both of mind and Christian character, and who was perhaps Keble's best counsellor until his death in 1860. He was a Fellow of Corpus, and Anglo-Saxon Professor at Oxford in 1812. All three, it will be noted, were clergymen. So, of course, was Arnold. Indeed, Coleridge appears to have been almost the only lay intimate Keble had.

---

\* He published also *A Christian Guide for Plain People*, said to be singularly clear, homely, wise, and Christian, and *Things after Death*.

It is a point to be observed in estimating the excellences and weaknesses of Keble's character, that having scarcely any but clerical relatives and friends, he was brought up within the circle of strictly clerical thought and feeling.

In Easter Term, 1810, Keble achieved a distinction which, up to that time, had been gained by no one but Peel; he was placed in both first classes. His youth—he was not quite eighteen—made his success the more remarkable. On the 20th April, in the year following, wanting then a few days of the completion of his nineteenth year, he was elected a Probationer Fellow of Oriel, and took his place at the High Table, and in the senior Common Room of that celebrated College. "Whately entered it with him, and they found Copleston and Davison in the lead of it." These two, in fact, were the *duumviri* to whom all paid an almost obsequious deference.

In 1812 he won the prizes for both the Bachelor's Essays—the English on translation from dead languages, the Latin a comparison of Xenophon and Julius Cæsar as military chroniclers. In the annals of Corpus twice only has such a triumph been won; "in one of these instances," says Sir John, "by no less a man than my old school-fellow and friend, the present Dean of St. Paul's." It is evident that for *present* here must be read *late*. Since Sir John began his book, Dean Milman, the Broad Churchman, has joined his High Church coeval, Keble. Coleridge, happy in his friendships on all sides, High Churchman though he was and is, retained his kindly intercourse with Milman, as he did his intimacy with Arnold, through life.

In the long vacation of 1813 he read with pupils at Sidmouth, where he rented a cottage. We catch a glimpse here of what he was as a young man.

"Those who have never known Keble familiarly or only in later life, will scarcely be prepared to hear with how quick a relish he entered into the gaieties of Sidmouth. At this time Torquay was little more than a fishing village, and Sidmouth, though a small place, was much frequented by families seeking to combine the pursuit of health for the delicate, with that of amusement for the healthy. It was consequently as much a winter watering-place as a summer, and much of social intercourse was maintained all through the winter. No one was better received than Keble, and no one, I may add, seemed to enjoy more heartily the morning or evening parties, the concerts, and dances, which were frequent; the scenery and the society both found him impressionable, and as was natural they had their effect upon his poetical powers; he composed more often and better than he had ever done before."—Pp. 51, 52.

He filled the responsible and onerous office of Examining Master in the years 1814—15. In 1814, on the death of a beloved sister, he thus expresses himself in a letter to Coleridge:—

“Another thing is that I cannot even now persuade myself I have lost her, except out of my sight. That she is happy I have (blessed be God for it!) the firmest faith, and that in her happiness she remembers us, whom living she never forgot, I fondly persuade myself. Whenever I think of this (and I have now made the thought habitual), it checks my grief, making it seem altogether selfish and unreasonable.”—P. 56.

In 1815 his thoughts were much occupied about his approaching ordination; and wishing to persuade his friend Coleridge to choose the same vocation, he wrote to him as follows:—

“I feel what it must be to forego the possibility, even though it were but just possible, of realising such hopes as these; nor do I think anything, not even the saving health and life, would make me forego them, but for visions far more brilliant and more certain too; more brilliant in their results, inasmuch as the salvation of one soul is worth more than the framing the Magna Charta of a thousand worlds; more certain to take place, since temptations are fewer, and opportunities everywhere to be found. Can there be even among the angels a higher privilege than we can form an idea of, than the power of contributing to the everlasting happiness of our neighbour, to be especially delegated and assigned to us by Almighty God? I would that I were as free from worldly care and ambition, as the thought of what I hope will be my high calling ought to make me. I know that I am never so free from evil thoughts as when these things are strongest on my mind, but how difficult to make them habitual!”—P. 57.

He was ordained by the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. William Jackson) deacon on Trinity Sunday, 1815, and priest on Trinity Sunday, 1816.

In 1817 Keble writes from his father's house at Fairford to Coleridge a letter, which shows in what old-fashioned loyalist principles he had grown up:—

“Next to the books which it is my duty to study, I find none so useful in helping me to considerations of this kind, as your and my friend and favourite Jeremy Taylor. Though I have been long acquainted with him, I never read his ‘Holy Living and Dying’ regularly till this spring, and I cannot tell you the delight it has given me; surely that book is enough to convert any infidel, so gentle in heart, and so high in mind, so fervent in zeal, and so charitable in judgment, that I confess I do not know any other author, except perhaps Hooker (whose subjects are so different that they will hardly bear a comparison), worthy

to be likened to him. Spenser, I think, comes nearest his spirit in all respects. Milton is like him in richness and depth, but in morality seems to me as far below him as pride is below humility. I have been looking into some of his prose works lately, of which, I am ashamed to say, I was and am grossly ignorant; but what will you think of me, when I own to you, that I was hardly ever so shocked and mortified in my life? perhaps I shall make some amends by my unbounded admiration of many passages; perhaps you will attribute it all to cavalierish and episcopalian prejudices, but certainly I shut the book with an increased veneration for his abilities, and a very much diminished confidence in his opinions, and affection for his general character. But I must try to get rid of the dislike, and lay his faults, if I can, upon times and circumstances, and not upon himself, for it is quite uncomfortable to think of such a man as from some places I was inclined to do. At any rate it must be a most impressive warning to men of genius, to read, as they often may, I think, in his Tracts, one sentence written as if an angel had held the pen, and the next (as it seemed to me) more like Cobbett's style than any other I know of. One thing rather pleases me (as everybody likes to be confirmed in his old prejudices), that the spirit of the loyal party in those times should seem so much more candid and charitable than that of the Puritans. Where will you find in Taylor, or Hammond, or Chillingworth, or Saunderson, or even in Clarendon, such a gross, puerile, liberal (not to say dishonest) invective, as Milton, evidently, *ad captandum vulgus*, has put into his Iconoclastes against K. Charles's Chaplains? How little did he dream that Taylor's name would go down to posterity side by side with his own, and the other three but a little below it.

"But enough of this declamation."—Pp. 68, 69.

It certainly is a thing to be noted and admired that John Keble, in his twenty-sixth year, should not only place Jeremy Taylor upon an absolute equality with Milton, but be capable of imagining that the names of Hammond, Chillingworth, and Saunderson stand at an elevation but a little below that which has been adjudged to Milton.

On his ordination in 1815, Keble took charge as curate, but with no resident superior, of two small and contiguous parishes—East Leach and Burthorpe. He rode to and fro between Oxford and his parishes for the services every other Sunday, his father, as it would appear, acting as his substitute on the alternate Sundays, besides attending to his own little parish of Coln St. Aldwins, of which the value was £60 a year. In the vacations Keble resided at Fairford with his father. In 1816 he seems to have left Oxford, having ceased to hold the office of Examiner, and to have retired to Fairford, living with his father and attending to his curacies. It was during this period that he wrote to Coleridge the letter from which



we have last quoted. Early in 1817, however, we find him again at Oxford, holding the onerous office of Examiner in the Responsions. "This last wearied him a gooddeal, and when it was performed he quitted Oxford with delight, as he thought, no more to return officially." Nevertheless, before the close of the year, having been applied to ~~to~~ take the office of College Tutor at Oriel—an office not only of distinguished honour, but of very considerable and permanent emolument, and which, added to his Fellowship, must have placed him in circumstances to minister effectually to the comfort of his family at home, he did not hesitate to accept the preferment, on the duties of which he entered with the beginning of 1818. In accepting this office he felt, like John Wesley, that he was in fact undertaking pastoral work and responsibilities. He went now, of course, to reside fully at Oxford, only going over to Fairford and his cure on Saturdays for the Sunday, and making his home at Fairford during the vacations.

It was while he was tutor at Oriel, and apparently about the year 1817, that he was introduced to Sir Wm. Heathcote, for so many years M.P. for Oxford, who, at first Keble's pupil, became afterwards his first and only patron.

A page or two back we gave a description of the manner in which, before his ordination, young Keble entered into the social life and amusements of Sidmouth. What we are about to quote shows how pleasant and vivacious a young gentleman Keble still remained in 1827, after he had been some years ordained. He was at this time not quite twenty-eight years old.

"He passed his Christmas Vacation, that of 1819—1820, as usual at Fairford, and I have seen many letters which passed between him and the family of the Curate of Fladbury, a Mr. Pruen, with whom he had become intimate in the course of his visits to his godfather the Rector. These show with what heartiness he joined in the social meetings of the season, kept up, as it should seem, very genially in the neighbourhood. As a younger man, and before he was in Holy Orders, no one enjoyed a dance more than he; nor did he think it now at all unbecoming to take his part in those which in truth were of the simplest kind, and scarcely more than family reunions. His religion, then and to the end, was cheerful, as was his natural temperament; and it may be collected from his letters at this period of his life what a favourite he was with young and old, how much his visits were courted, and his friendship valued. I mention the Pruen family as an instance; it consisted of the father and mother, a governess as I collect, and a numerous family, principally girls of different ages, but all apparently, at the time I speak of, in the schoolroom, or, as to one or two, just issuing from it. Many letters passed between him and them, full of merri-

ment and fun, queer riddles, familiar poetry, with sometimes graver matters insinuated; I do not publish them, and yet they exhibit in a lively way that side of his character, well known indeed to those who were intimate with him, but of which those who only knew him at a distance, or by his writings, or later in life, can scarcely be aware. Somehow, as life advanced on both sides, and graver interests absorbed him, the intercourse between him and the members of this family appears to have ceased, but not the kindly feeling. It was when he was at Bournemouth, in the last illness of himself and Mrs. Keble, that one of his former young friends, Margaret Pruett, who had married and I believe become a widow, wrote to him from Torquay; I do not know the subject of her letter, it was probably to inquire about his health, and to remind him of old times and old feelings; I cannot forbear to print the answer which he wrote: the writing is in a very feeble hand, a sad contrast to the firm and distinct character of the letters from which I have hitherto been quoting: it may seem a sad, yet it is a very soothing close to the correspondence:—

“ ‘BOURNEMOUTH, Jan. 17, 1866.

“ ‘MY DEAR MARGARET,—

“ ‘For why should I not speak as in the old times which you so kindly remember?—you put me to shame by your kind, long letter—long, I mean, in comparison of what I can write; and by your affectionate remembrance of one who has somehow been drawn so far away from you all. It is too good of you, but to me refreshing, to have such a report of your dear sister and the rest who are left you. I thank you for it; and all of you, in sight and out of sight, I thank, for your constant kindness, with all my heart, and trust to be remembered by you at this time, especially *then* when we all wish most to be remembered. For my dear wife's long trial of illness seems now to be approaching its end; we came here in October, being obliged to go somewhere, and she feeling herself unequal to the journey further west, and she certainly gains no strength: but thanks be to God, as far as health allows, she is bright and cheerful as ever, and takes all her old interest in things. I send her kind love with my own. I cannot write more at present; except that I am very sorry to hear of Henry's painful complaint, and not a little ashamed to think of my godson, and how I have neglected him all this time. I yet hope we may have some communication, although my chance of it, humanly speaking, is fast<sup>ly</sup> lessening; however, assure him of my constant remembrance of him. What you say of your dear Anne's gentleness, and loving simple ways, brings her back to me as I could wish, and so does the place about Fladbury churchyard.

“ ‘God grant us all, how unworthy soever some of us may now feel ourselves, a happy meeting in the end!

“ ‘I am always, my dear Friend,

“ ‘Affectionately yours,

“ ‘J. KEBLE.

“ ‘To Mrs. Billamore, 6, Scarborough terrace, Torquay.’ ”

Keble was still resident as a tutor of Oriel at the Oxford Commemoration of 1820, when Southey visited Oxford. We cannot but quote the account of Southey's visit and reception.

"I had the great delight this last Commemoration of being introduced to the two public characters whom of all others I should rather wish to know, Southey and Reginald Heber. I liked both exceedingly, but Heber decidedly best: he is so remarkably unaffected in his manner; I watched him all the time they were performing '*Palestine*' in the theatre, and he did not attitudinise in the least, nor seem conscious of being the chief character in the room; and then his style of conversation is so particularly kind and hearty. Southey has a good deal of the same excellencies; but he gives you the idea of a man forbearing to display himself, Heber of one into whose head no such thing ever entered. Nevertheless Southey quite made good his ground in my favour, more completely a good deal than I had expected. He is now an orthodox man, and the faults of his views in ecclesiastical matters are, as far as I could judge from what he said, the faults into which such persons are most apt to fall—making religion too much a matter of politics—and the like."—P. 94.

How characteristic are some of the touches here! At this time, in 1820, Heber was hardly known beyond Oxford, or known only as a rising clergyman and a graceful minor poet. He was not yet *Bishop* Heber, not even *Bampton Lecturer*. Whereas Southey was a famous man of letters, ripe in knowledge of the widest range, and a really eminent poet. Nevertheless, the Oxford College tutor, the same who rated the chaplains of Charles I. as all but the equals of Milton, evidently criticises the respective deportments of the young Oxonian of modest fame, and the veteran critic, historian, and poet, as if Heber were at all events as great a man as Southey. The incapacity to form an estimate of any man's character or performances, apart from his opinions, was, to the end one of Keble's great defects. His power of sympathy was limited; it was altogether personal, and derived exclusively from his affections. Of intellectual sympathy, of broad social sympathy, of the general power of entering into the difficulties, the perplexities, the mental and moral peculiarities and personality of others, whose characters and circumstances may be widely different from one's own, Keble seems to have had no share. The dramatic faculty, the dramatic insight and feeling, were wanting to him.

But if he could not enter into the personality of other men, which is the secret of dramatic power and the spring of all-embracing human sympathy, he was quick to catch the echoes and the analogies of his own feelings in all around him,

whether living companions or the scenes of nature. His own shy and sensitive nature looked and listened for sympathy with himself. Too shy and sensitive to ask or to intimate a desire, he deeply welcomed all responsive warmth of feeling. His was a feminine nature, but it was of the most retiring and introspective kind. He deeply loved and tenderly cared for all who were in unison with himself; he had not the gift, by going forth with his sympathy towards others, to elicit a flow of generous kindliness from them. Hence his affections, while intense and concentrated, operated within a narrow range.

This characteristic is strikingly exemplified in his poetry. The dramatic faculty is altogether wanting in it. He is not drawn out beyond himself into sympathy with nature or with any beings whatsoever, but he catches the forms, the colours, the tones, in nature and in life, which harmonise with his own feelings and personality. He reduces all to his own standard, he suffuses all with his own colouring. We will give one instance which we find here to our hand, by way of exemplifying our meaning. The letter was addressed to his friend Cornish.

"I wish you had been with me on the hill just now, and then I should not have gone to sleep in a sort of cave, which they have cut out, looking all over Herefordshire, with a telescope in my hand, reading Spenser. 'Do you know the Shepherd's Calendar?' I think you did not use to know it, for you did not use to quote it, which you certainly would. What a delightful feel it is to sit under the shelter of one of the rocks here, and hear the wind sweeping with that peculiar kind of strong moaning sigh, which it practises on the bent grass. I dare say you have marked it a hundred times; but I was never so much struck with it as this evening."—P. 101.

In 1821, Keble again accepted the office of Examining Master, and continued to serve until the Easter of 1823, sighing, however, for a country home and a curacy. "We here at Oxford," he says, in 1823, "go on much as usual, criticising sermons, eating dinners, and laughing at Buckland and Shuttleworth. I feel as if I should be very glad to get away to some country curacy," &c. With the death of his mother, in May, 1823, his residence at Oxford came to an end, after an all but unbroken connection of seventeen years.

Retaining his Fellowship, for the enjoyment of which he might fairly consider that he had given adequate work and service to Oriel, he retired to Fairford, where his two sisters were resident with his father. In addition to his two small and neighbouring churches and curacies, he took a third, at Southrop, a small parish very near the other two.

Keble used his house at Southrop for the convenience of a few of his late pupils, who resorted to him thither from Oxford, "occasionally for long visits; some received into the house, some finding lodgings near; among these" his biographer names three men who showed later in life the quality of the training they had received under Keble, by the lengths to which they went in the ultra-"Catholic" direction, and by the intensity of their anti-Puritan animosity. They were "Robert Wilberforce, Isaac Williams, Hurrell Froude." Wilberforce became the subtle schoolman and theologian of the party whose realistic heresy as to the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, and the sacramental "extensions of the Incarnation," has spread very far among "Catholics," tainting with dangerous heterodoxy even Mr. Liddon's noble sermons, and weakening and vitiating in part the grand argument of his *Bampton Lectures*. Isaac Williams became the poet of the Catholic renaissance, not in its earlier stage as represented by the *Christian Year*, but in that stage which brought the whole school, before they knew it, fairly within the territory of Rome. Hurrell Froude, fond upon his friends, but fierce, bitter, flippant in his hostility to every name, however noble and famous, and every system, however sustained by heroism, purity, tenderness, or wisdom, by human goodness or the loftiness of Christian intellect and genius, which savoured in the least of the doctrines of Puritanism or the principles of Nonconformity, is a familiar character to the readers of this Journal. Such was the trio that resorted to Keble, as their "guide, philosopher, and friend," such were the favourite pupils of the poet of the *Christian Year*. It seems passing strange that such a poet should have trained such disciples. It suggests to us that there must have been a potent *disciplina arcani* at work in these bachelor retreats,—Keble's, at Fairford, as afterwards that of Newman, at Little Dale, which distilled bitterness and bigotry into the inner springs of character in those who resorted thither. Given the hierarchical postulate of Apostolical succession, an intense political and quasi-religious Toryism which sought its ideal in the principles and sympathies of Charles I. and Laud, and the Cavalier party in general, an utter unacquaintedness with the broad social and denominational realities of English life, the clannishness and tendency to exaggeration characteristic of a fellowship of young men, separated both from family life and from general society, and finally, the tendencies and besetments of an ecclesiastical clique, a knot of gowned men in "holy orders," who are sui-

rounded by such conditions as we have now described, and we need hardly wonder at any lengths of anti-rational other-worldliness to which they might lead each other on. In such circumstances, tenderness turns to rancour, zeal to fierceness, buoyancy of nature to flippant overbearingness, puerility blends inseparably with enthusiasm and with devotion, all theories are pushed to extremes, a partisanship which is never checked by wholesome opposition, never challenged by the presence of a judicial critic, finds vent sometimes in cheap and empty satire against the absent and imaginary antagonist, and sometimes in ebullitions of laddish ferocity—the intercourse of the one-sided community being equally distinguished, now by the outbursts of a curious, unmusical merriment, and now by the assumption of an amateur and somewhat superficial asceticism. Of the satire and merriment, we apprehend there must have been more at Southrop, of the asceticism, much more, two years later, at Littledale, where, at that later stage and under Newman, the thoughts and feelings of the party had been deepened in tone, and, altogether, had become more real and more gravely earnest.

Of Froude, Sir John Coleridge has given us a much more pleasant picture than any which has before been given to the world. Coleridge knew his father and mother, and knew him from a child. He too, like so many of Keble's set, was the son of a clergyman. Like his father, we are told, "he was clever, knowing, quick, and handy;" like his mother, "sensitive, intellectual, imaginative."

Farther on in the volume, in connection with the death of Froude in 1838, there are some remarks which we may quote here, as illustrating the relations which united two men in several respects so strongly contrasted as Keble and Froude.

"His death was a heavy blow to him, and no wonder; those who knew him, but were not on terms of intimacy, could not but regard mournfully the end of one so accomplished, so gifted, so good, and so pure; a man of such remarkable promise, worn out in the very prime of life by slow and wasting and long hopeless disease. But it was much more than this with Keble—they were more like elder and younger brothers; reverence in some sort sanctified Froude's love for Keble, and moderated the sallies of his somewhat too quick and defiant temper, and imparted a special diffidence to his opposition in their occasional controversies with each other; while a sort of paternal fondness in Keble gave unusual tenderness to his friendship for Froude, and exaggerated perhaps his admiration for his undoubted gifts of head and heart. And



these were greater than mere acquaintances would be aware of; for he did not present the best aspects of himself to common observation."—P. 243.

It is plain—from some remarks which follow—that Keble's biographer feels that his friend's share in the publication of Froude's *Remains*, and in general his singularly warm admiration for Froude, are points which do not tend to exalt him in the judgment of wise men. And no wonder, when we remember what judgment Coleridge's dear friend Arnold pronounced on the *Remains* as especially remarkable for the "extraordinary impudence" with which he, "a young man," and an English clergyman, "reviled" the saints and heroes and martyrs of his own Church, and, in a word, all the men most highly honoured by the Church of England, when we remember that Froude did not scruple to confess that he "hated the Reformation," to say nothing of his violent abomination of Puritanism and his intense antipathy and scorn for "irreverent Dissenters." But in fact, there was in Keble himself an intense antipathy to Puritanism and Non-conformity, a deeply rooted intolerance of principle, a sedate and decorous, but most narrow and steadfast, bigotry, which constituted in him a fund of real approbation and sympathy for the principles and prejudices of Froude. Their tempers were different, but their principles were identical. Froude's animosities corresponded to Keble's dislikes, and his enthusiastic and passionate admiration was bestowed in accordance with Keble's warmest sympathies.

It will not be forgotten that it was through the good offices of Froude that Newman, who had been chosen Fellow of Oriel in 1822, was, about the year 1828, after six years of distant acquaintanceship, brought into relations of confidence and intimacy with Keble. Froude was accustomed to say that his having accomplished this union was "the one good thing" he had done in his life. Newman and Keble were very unlike each other—Keble mild, domestic, plain, practical, synthetic, Newman energetic, enterprising, subtle, speculative, analytic; Keble a tutor and a pastor, with no gift of eloquence, although a poet in grain; Newman a tutor indeed, but moreover a preacher of rare eloquence, a controversialist, a man of restless force and of daring aim; Keble a home-spun Englishman; Newman a man of cosmopolitan sympathy and scope. In Froude, however, who, through circumstances, had come under the influence of Keble as his tutor, and in turn had fascinated his tutor by his bold, fresh, restless, but withal loving and "Catholic" spirit, but whose natural sym-

pathies were much more with Newman than with Keble, was found the common solvent, the medium of powerful affinities with both, through whose contact and influence characters so sharply contrasted were combined in sympathy and counsel.

Early in 1824 a remarkable appointment was made to a colonial see. A cousin of the biographer—William Hart Coleridge—although quite a young man, whose only experience of ecclesiastical labour and responsibilities had been gained in a London curacy, was elevated to the episcopal dignity, as Bishop of Barbados. This juvenile father of the Church pressed Keble to go out with him as one of his archdeacons—Archdeacon of Barbados, with £2,000 a year. It appears that he was much gratified with the offer, and he writes to his friend Dyson, "I do not say I should not have been dazzled by it, if my father had not been so decided as he was." A Fellow of Oriel dazzled by a Barbados archdeaconry! The phraseology speaks much for the simplicity and something also as to the hierarchical susceptibility of the writer. The money, doubtless, might not unreasonably have had its attractions, and would have had for many. But it was not of the revenue Keble was thinking, only of the preferment. We suppose in the view of an unsophisticated son of the Anglican prophets, an archdeaconry was an archdeaconry anywhere, just as many simple folk regard a colonial bishop of Petty City, in Wastelands, Savage Realm, as no less mighty and exalted a Lord Bishop than the consecrated of London or Lincoln. As for real Christian influence, for real dignity and enjoyment, Keble's position when he was at Oxford, and still more afterwards when he was beneficed at Hursley, was incomparably superior to the Archdeaconry of Barbados, where planters and bond slaves, in the worst days of planter tyranny and of slave oppression, would have been his constituents, and little would have come beneath his immediate cognisance but ignorance and demoralisation, oppression and suffering. These little matters reveal a great deal. Keble's gratification and sense of exaltation at the proposal made to him by his dignified friend, the boy-bishop, are characteristic of the ecclesiastical school in which he had grown up, of the unreal atmosphere of ecclesiastical illusion in which he lived.

In 1825, he yielded, after much hesitation, to the urgency of his old friend and former pupil Sir W. Heathcote, and accepted the curacy of Hursley, with sole charge, Archdeacon Heathcote being the vicar. Here his father and his sisters spent much happy time during the one bright year in which he held the curacy. Nothing is more beautiful about Keble

than the tender care and love with which he cherished and watched over his own family from his youth upwards. Of his sisters he said, very pleasantly, that the one was his wife, the other his sweetheart; which he loved best, neither he nor any knew. But during this year, his "sweetheart" younger sister died, so that his very aged father was left with only a frail and invalid daughter to keep him company at Fairford. Mr. Thomas Keble was by this time married and unable to live with his father. Keble's filial piety did not allow him to hesitate under these circumstances. He relinquished his advantageous and happy position at Hursley, and returned to Fairford to live with his father. So ended, sadly, perhaps the most pleasant episode in Keble's life. He returned to Fairford in October, 1826. His father's health began now rapidly to give way; and the son took the father's duties. He was also bringing to a finish his preparation of the *Christian Year*, on which he had been engaged many years. "He was busy too in his theological reading, and acquiring that intimate knowledge of the Fathers which had such a marked influence on his theological feeling and the habitual train of his thoughts on any religious question. He was examining, too, with an interest awakened by the times, the foundation and limits of the alliance of Church and State, specially of the right of the latter to interfere with the former in matters purely ecclesiastical." All which studies were presently to bear fruit in connection with the *Tracts for the Times*, *The Library of the Fathers*, and other Anglo-Catholic enterprises. Up to this time Keble had been a High Churchman by sentiment and sympathy, both politically and ecclesiastically, but he had not intellectually mastered and assimilated any complete theological and hierarchical theory. From this time the "Catholic" theology of penance, confession, and the Eucharist, all that belongs to the doctrine of necessary and exclusive sacramental grace, was to be growing and settling into solid symmetry within his mind.

His friends Dyson, Cornish, Coleridge, and, above all, Davison, who was much his senior, all assisted him in revising his poems for the *Christian Year*. The volume was at length published in June, 1827, and during less than twenty-six years thereafter, i.e. up to January, 1854, 108,000 copies were sold in forty-three editions.\* It is well known that the beautiful and costly church at Hursley was rebuilt out of the

---

\* Within nine months after Keble's death seven editions were issued consisting of 11,000 copies.

profits of the volume. Of the merits of the *Christian Year*, and of the special advantages which have contributed to increase its popularity, and extend its circulation, we have written in that former paper on Keble to which we referred at the outset of this article. Here we shall content ourselves with saying that one cause of its popularity was that, although tenderly and thoroughly Anglican, it was *not* ultra-Catholic in its theology and ecclesiastical colouring. Many years afterwards, writing to his friend Coleridge, Keble expressed his painful sense of the deficiencies of his theology, and the want of Catholic reality in his doctrine, at the time of his writing the *Christian Year*. The change in one of the stanzas on the "Gunpowder Treason," which Keble authorised but a short while before his death, and by which the words "Present in the heart, *not* in the hand," as applied to the Lord Jesus in the Eucharist, were changed into "Present in the heart *as* in the hand," was not due to any unfair influence used with him by Pusey or anyone else; it did but express what had always been his theology since he had clearly defined it to himself. As to this matter the testimony of Sir John T. Coleridge is decisive. He has fully cleared up all that relates to it. Keble's deliberate, but delayed intention, has been fulfilled by his executors, in conformity with his authoritative request.

It is well to compare the impressions which are made on men of intelligence who look at affairs from a point of view opposite to that which we ourselves occupy. In 1828, the year Newman and Keble became intimate, we find Keble complaining emphatically; in a letter dated from Lyme in Dorsetshire, of "the amazing rate at which Puritanism seems to be getting on all over the kingdom." "If I may judge," he adds, "from what I heard in church and out, the old-fashioned way of divinity is quite the exception, not the rule, in that district." In a comment on this passage, Sir J. T. Coleridge speaks of Keble as maintaining, on grounds well settled in his own mind, "an unfavourable opinion" in regard to the special theological views, and to the general temper and influence, of the "party in the Church which was then fighting its way upwards to what I suppose it must be admitted that it has now attained, a more than equal share in numbers and influence."\*

From this it appears that in Sir J. T. Coleridge's view the "Puritan" party in the Church of England has gained much

ground during the last forty years. The opinion will strike most of our readers as very strange. If, after all, it be anything like true, we can only conclude that both the High and Low Church parties have immensely gained upon the wide, waste field of religious indifferentism. That the High Church party has absolutely lost ground, cannot surely be what Sir John means his readers to understand. And we confess our own judgment agrees with that which generally prevails, so far at least as we know, that the preponderance of gain in influence and development has been largely in favour of the High, of the ultra-High, school of hierarchical doctrine.

In 1829, Keble worked with Newman (they were High Church bigoted *Protestants* in those days) to throw out Sir Robert Peel as member for the University, because of the part he had taken in "Catholic Emancipation." Coleridge was too candid, too eclectic, and too judicial a thinker to go with the majority in this matter. "So," he says, "I resolved to vote for Mr. Peel, and I would not decline to be on his committee. My dear friend was very much distressed: he wrote shortly and with some heat, and evidently in a wounded spirit. It must be remembered that on all such questions his opinions were 'stuff of the conscience.' How I answered him I do not remember; but we met at the election with perfect cordiality, and his letters resumed immediately their old affectionate tone."\*

In 1830 and 1831 Keble was nominated by his University Examiner at the India House. In 1831 he began his long and loving labour upon Hooker's Works, especially (of course) the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. This labour was not completed till 1836. The merits of his edition are universally recognised. In one thing, however, he conspicuously failed, viz. in his attempt to prove that Hooker was a hierarchical and high Sacramentarian Churchman.

In the same year, 1831, he was elected Professor of Poetry at Oxford. In 1833 he preached the Summer Assize Sermon, on *National Apostacy*, a sermon which Newman has redeemed from obscurity, where it lay *perdu* in a volume never called for (*Academical and Occasional Sermons*), by tracing to it the original impulse of the Tractarian movement. He tells us that he has always kept the day on which it was preached as an anniversary. The sermon, however, must have been the mere occasion, not in any sense the *cause* of the combination from which the movement arose; it was the taper by which a train

was ignited. There is nothing wonderful about it; it is a solemn but feeble *threnody* on the deepening politico-ecclesiastical liberalism of the nation, mingled with exhortations to the pious not to cease to pray for their country. But the "times were ripe." The hour and the man had come—that man was Newman, mightily helped throughout by Pusey, shielded and recommended by the support of Keble's churchly, decorous, and prudent-seeming goodness.

Still, though Newman was the master spirit, Keble seems to have been the first mover, in the way of correspondence, in regard to the series of Oxford Tracts. Letters are here cited addressed to several friends to whom he opened the subject. The enforcement of the dogma of Apostolical succession, and the protection of the Prayer-Book from innovation, are the points named in his letters as chiefly to be kept in view. Keble's own Tracts were, No. iv, on "Apostolical Succession;" No. xii, on the "Principle which regulated the Selection of the Sunday Lessons;" No. xl, on "Marriage with an unbaptised Person;" No. lxxix, on the "Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church." We do not imagine that anyone would claim for either of these the credit of remarkable ability. The last seems to us to be the only one possessing any sort of value. Keble, however, did a good deal in the way of corresponding and editing.

We shall not attempt here any estimate of the Oxford movement, whether in its principles or its consequences; nor is it needful for us to criticise Sir J. T. Coleridge's favourable but qualified, and somewhat timid, verdict on its whole result. It is plain, from many passages in this volume, that Sir John does not at all realise the fact that the infidelity at Oxford and elsewhere, which he considers the opposite extreme, and which he sets against it, is, in fact, to a large extent a reaction from the superstitions of the party to which Keble belonged.

In 1835, Keble's father died—a patriarch of ninety years. The way was now plain to his settlement in life. Sir W. Heathcote, at the same time, offered to him the *Vicarage* (not now the *Curacy*) of Hursley. He accepted it, and married. His wife was the sister of his brother's wife, and both were the daughters of a Gloucestershire clergyman of the name of Clarke.

From the time of his settlement at Hursley, Keble certainly did not abate in his High Church progress. How austere narrow he was in his judgments of men as well as of doctrine will be seen from the following extracts.

"He writes playfully to me at an earlier time:—'Hurrell Froude and I took into our consideration your opinion that "there are good men of

all p  
being  
called  
the m  
"  
nion  
conc  
inter  
narr  
him,  
cere  
tion  
"  
extr  
Alex  
tion  
desir  
"  
very  
his  
Met  
" ac  
ning  
on i  
priv  
gre  
thin  
his  
Div  
tion  
a h  
Pri  
up  
sup  
not  
all  
I  
bec  
can  
  
ed  
Ne  
Ro  
  
co  
th  
ha



all parties," and agreed that it is a bad doctrine for these days; the time being come in which, according to John Miller, "scoundrels must be called scoundrels;" and moreover we have stigmatised the said opinion by the name of the Coleridge Heresy. So hold it any longer at your peril.'

"I think it fair to set down these which were in truth formed opinions, and not random sayings; but it would be most unfair, if one concluded from them, written or spoken in the freedom of friendly intercourse, that there was anything sour in his spirit, or harsh or narrow in his practice; when you discussed any of these things with him, the discussion was pretty sure to end, not indeed with any insincere concession of what he thought right and true, but in consideration for individuals, and depreciation of himself.

"I give, from a letter to myself, dated Hursley, Oct. 23, 1838, an extract more considered, and not unimportant. I had been reading Alexander Knox's Remains, and been much struck by them, and mentioned them to him. He says in the course of a long letter (and I desire to draw attention to the close of the extract):—

"As touching Mr. Knox, whom you have been reading, I admire him very much in some respects, and think he did the world great service by his "Treatise on the Eucharist;" but I cannot admit his symbolising with Methodists to be at all Catholic; quite the contrary, for Catholic means "according to the rule of the whole uncorrupt Church from the beginning;" and Mr. Knox's admiration of Wesley and Co. was founded first on his own private personal experience, and then justified by his own private personal interpretation of Church History. Surely it was a great fallacy of his, that where he saw the good effect of a thing, the thing itself is to be approved. You know how it issued in the case of his friend Mr. Forster, that he made out Mahometanism to be a kind of Divine dispensation; and in itself surely it is rather an arrogant position in which Mr. K. delighted to imagine himself, as one on the top of a high hill, seeing which way different schools tend (the school of Primitive Antiquity being but one among many), and passing judgment upon each how far it is right, and how well it suited its time—himself superior to all, exercising a royal right of eclecticism over all. It does not seem to me to accord very well with the notion of a faith "once for all delivered to the saints." I speak the more feelingly because I know I was myself inclined to eclecticism at one time; and if it had not been for my father and my brother, where I should have been now who can say?"—Pp. 241, 242.

From 1838, and for many years, Keble lent help, partly as editor, in the publication of the *Library of the Fathers*. Mr. Newman was the leading spirit in this work, till he left for Rome. Dr. Pusey took a principal part throughout.

Sir J. T. Coleridge slightly sketches the history of the condemnation of *Tract XC*. It was to his friend Coleridge that Keble addressed that letter in defence of the *Tract* which has lately (1865) been republished by Dr. Pusey, and in which

Keble took an equal share of responsibility for the opinions and judgments embodied in the tract with Newman himself. Sir John explains why he felt that he could not refuse his name to Keble in addressing the letter, and, at the same time, explains that he by no means approves of the tract itself, as a whole, especially considering the time and circumstances under which it was published, and would not be understood to agree with all that Keble urges in apology for it.

The one thing to be said on behalf of Keble, Newman, and the whole Ultra party, is that the premisses from which the whole system of "Catholic" doctrine may, without any extravagant forcing, be inferred, seem to be in part, distinctly, and in part indistinctly, yet virtually presupposed or implied in various formularies of the Church of England, and that this doctrine, in its essentials, has in fact been held and taught by a *catena* of distinguished Church of England divines—some of them bishops, others at least doctors or dignitaries, from the time of James the First to the present time, and especially that some of those divines who were most intimately and authoritatively connected with the revision of the Prayer-Book and the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662, held this Catholic system in almost its highest strain. It appears certain that Keble honestly believed that Puritanism, as he called it, was alien from the Church of England, was an intrusion and a heresy. At the same time, he must surely have known that he and his fellows had pushed their Catholicism far beyond the limits which had been respected by the great majority of the High Church authorities in the past, that he not only left Hooker very far in the rear, but had gone a long way beyond his own special saint and hero, Bishop Wilson.

In 1845 Newman joined the Church of Rome, which was the greatest sorrow of Keble's life. In the same year Keble published his *Lyra Innocentium*, as a means of adding to his resources, chiefly accruing from the sale of the *Christian Year*, for building Hursley Church; two other churches in attached parishes he had already rebuilt. In this book the advance he had made in doctrine during the twenty years which had passed since he published the *Christian Year* is partly shown, and is shown to have been very great. But it is but partially shown. On the urgency of his friends Coleridge being one of these, Keble was induced to suppress several hymns, which, if published, would have alarmed and incensed public feeling. One of these Keble's oldest and best friend has felt it to be

his duty to print in this volume. We subjoin the latter part of it. In this Mary is addressed as "Mother of God"—

"Whom thousand worlds adore,  
He calls thee Mother evermore."

Keble resolutely defended the language we have quoted, and expressed his great surprise that his friends should object to it. In a letter to Coleridge, dated 18th June, 1845, there occurs the following sentence :—

"No doubt there would be the difference in tone which you take notice of between this and the former book, for when I wrote that, I did not understand (to mention no more points) either the doctrine of Repentance, or that of the Holy Eucharist, as held, e.g. by Bishop Ken, nor that of Justification."

This period of Keble's life, that is, the ten years following the condemnation of *Tract XC.*, was a period of very painful perplexity as to the relative claims and position of the Anglican and the Roman Churches. He was determined he could not go to Rome, but for a considerable time he was in doubt whether he must not leave the Church of England, or at least subside into the position of a communicant without a charge. He did not see how to justify his Church's position, while her doctrine, he felt, was painfully deficient, and her condition distracted. On the other hand, the canonical position of the Church of Rome was perfect, but her doctrine was corrupted with superfluities and falsities. A distressing picture of perplexities is exhibited in these pages.

It was to meet the case of many High "Catholics" who were in the like perplexities with himself, that Keble wrote the Preface to his volume of *Academical and Occasional Sermons*. Keble's defences of the Church of England are throughout faint, feeble, extenuatory; his objections to the Church of Rome timid and deferential. His one strong reason for remaining in the Church of England was, that he was actually there, and knew not whither else to betake himself. For a national, an exclusive, a "Catholic and Apostolic" Church, it is humiliating if this is the very strongest argument to be addressed to its adherents. Such twine as this would not hold Newman or Manning. But Keble was domestic, unenterprising, happily fixed in an honoured privacy. He could not tear himself from the Church of his fathers, his friends, and his country.

At this time Keble's doctrine included, besides Apostolical succession and sacramental grace, Eucharistical adoration,

confession and penance, the invocation of saints, the "Virgin Mother" above all, and prayers for the dead, with, of course, the semi-purgatorial view of the intermediate state which such prayers imply.

Some time before 1849 Keble had engaged himself to co-operate in editing a *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, and in connection with this had promised to write the life of Bishop Wilson, and superintend an edition of his works. Keble was a slow performer, and did not complete his engagement till 1863. As early, however, as 1849 he made a summer trip to the Isle of Man, that he might "procure information on the spot and see the places in which the Bishop lived and acted for so many years of his life. After his return he wrote to his friend as follows:—

"I have lots to say about Mona, and Bishop Wilson, but cannot now go on with it; the tour was a very pleasant, and on the whole not an unsuccessful, one. The Bishop *very* kind and hospitable, and as off-hand as Lloyd used to be. The clergy a nice set, but rather Wesleyanised."

"I believe (adds Sir John) Lord Auckland will not be offended at this free comparison of him with Bishop Lloyd; in Keble's mouth it meant a great compliment, for the Bishop of Oxford was one in whom he delighted; nor, I trust, will the clergy of the Island, should any of them chance to see it, be scandalised at his remark on them."—P. 353.

During the last fifteen years of his life, although as high a Churchman as ever, Keble seems to have found more to object to in Rome and Romanism, and to have become sedately settled in his own Church.

In the early part of this period the defection of Archdeacon Wilberforce was a severe trial to him.

To his friend and former curate, Mr. Wilson, a "Catholic," as ultra as himself, he thus wrote in 1854:—

"Poor dear R. W., I own I was surprised at last; for the last report I had heard was an improved one, and I had heard nothing for a long time. . . . I dare say your account of it is the right one; but it disappoints and mortifies one to see one, who used to be so truthful and candid, lending himself at once to the violent contradictions of fact, and *petitiones principii*, which are quite necessary to every part almost of the Roman Theory. I wish I could compose, and write on it; it would be a sort of relief. In theory, I think his position of Lay Communion is tenable; at least, I wish to think so; for at the rate men are getting on, no one can say how soon he may himself be reduced to it. But I do not in the least expect that R. W. will have patience for it. I hear he is very miserable; from himself I have had only one short and kind note. . . ."—Pp. 401, 402.

And, again, a little later he writes to the biographer as to the same subject :—

"Poor dear R. W., whose departure touches *me* almost more nearly than any one's ; except, perhaps, that of Newman himself. I did not until very lately think that he would really go *there*. I thought he was too good-tempered, besides his learning and truthfulness. But he had got into an Utopian dream, and rather than give it up, he shut his eyes and made a jump, and now he must, and I suppose will, keep his eyes shut all his life long."—Pp. 403, 404.

No truer or more graphic description than this in the last sentence was ever given of the process by which such men as Wilberforce and Manning are first brought to embrace Romanism, and then harden and sharpen into Ultramontaniam.

We regret that our limits will not admit of our quoting from a later letter to Mr. and Mrs. Wilson, then at Rome, which show how salutary an effect had been produced on his correspondents by their visit to Rome itself. Keble also, it is evident, shared in the benefit which his friends had derived. He was now revolting from the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception," and altogether becoming a trifle more Protestant in his feeling.

In the ecclesiastical suit against Archdeacon Denison on the subject of the "Real Presence," like all of his school, Keble was profoundly grieved and disturbed by the Archbishop's judgment ; he published, however, a treatise on *Eucharistical Adoration*, in which, while upholding the ultra-Catholic doctrine and practice, he endeavoured to show his brethren how and why they should outwardly submit, although inwardly, and in the secret practice of their soul, adhering to their doctrine. In the controversy also which Bishop Forbes, the most extreme Catholic even in Scotland itself, maintained, as to some points connected with this same subject, with Bishop Wordsworth, and the rest of the Scotch bishops (whose exalted Ultraism, one might have thought, would surely have been extreme enough even for Keble), he was the active friend, the constant adviser, the zealous partisan, against his old friend, Bishop Wordsworth, of the Catholic champion Forbes, and even made two journeys to Scotland, being sixty-six years old, on purpose, by his presence and counsel, to comfort and sustain the dissident bishop.

He took a chief part, both by his pen and by the exertion of his utmost influence, in opposition to the changes in the law of divorce, and in support of the existing law in relation to

marriage with a deceased wife's sister; he did what he could to oppose—not, however, unreasonably or uncharitably—the progress of university reform; diligently to the last he did his public and controversial duty according to his own conception of it. He greatly rejoiced in the revised and extended High Churchism of the last few years. Mr. Legeyt—now a leading Ritualist—had indeed been his curate. In a letter to his biographer he expresses his strong and sanguine hopes for Oxford and his Church, “if the colleges are left alone, and if the present leaven of No. XC., so marvellously reviving, go on and prosper.” Some of the Ritualists, however, offended him by their haste, rashness, and want of charity, as was shown by his note on the subject, originally published in the *Literary Churchman*, and which has since been published in various journals.

We have no space left to give any details of Keble's death (by paralysis on the 29th March, 1866), of which, indeed, and the circumstances connected with it, we gave some account in our former article on Keble.

Keble's name can never be lost sight of as one of the chief leaders of the Anglo-Catholic school. But he will be known, read, and loved only as the poet of the *Christian Year*. It is true that this volume, redolent of Wordsworth and Scott, and everywhere wanting in intellectual force, although full of refined pictorial beauty, of exquisite glimpses of scenery, and of tender Christian feeling, has been overrated. But not the less is it adapted to be popular among refined and meditative Christians, and especially as a companion to the English Prayer Book, having as such no rival. There are, as Sir J. T. Coleridge says, some poems in *Lyra Innocentium*, and some from the same pen in *Lyra Apostolica*, decidedly finer and higher in strain than almost any in the *Christian Year*. But these books are saturated with sacramental superstition, and are so abhorrent to true Catholicism because of their ultra and exclusive “Catholicism,” so called, that they will never be extensively popular. Meantime, let us learn from Keble's intolerance, combined with eminent goodness, from his errors and superstitions, allied to undeniable saintliness, to be ourselves tolerant even to the intolerant, and to believe in the Christian character and goodness even of those who hand us over to the position of unbaptised “rationalists,” or “heathen” beneficiaries of God's “uncovenanted grace.”

---



## LITERARY NOTICES.

---

The Life of the Rev. Thomas Collins. By the Rev. Samuel Coley. London: Elliot Stock. 1868.

THIS is not a book for pedants or weaklings of any kind. Narrowness, arrogance, pomposity, affectation, *id genus omne*, whether professedly religious or otherwise, must beware of it. It will scare them, shrivel them up, make a laughing stock of them before earth and heaven. But for all truly good, wise and earnest men, whether they be preachers, teachers, theologians, philanthropists, philosophers, or whether simply private and unlearned members of the brotherhood of Christian faith and charity, Mr. Coley's volume is one of rare worth and interest. The subject, indeed, has no fascination either of novelty or popular sentiment belonging to it. It is the life of a Methodist minister of humble origin, of no pretensions to brilliancy, erudition, or ecclesiastical statesmanship, even in his own denomination holding scarcely any great trust beyond his divine calling. How this plain and comparatively obscure man was converted; how he came to be a minister; how he went from circuit to circuit, as the Methodist phrase is, in different parts of Great Britain; how he laboured and suffered, and then died in Christ; this is the story. And if the fact of the writer being himself a Methodist minister be a commendation to popular sympathy, and not a foil upon it, his personal relationship to Mr. Collins will hardly be taken as a favourable auspice by those who are familiar with the walks of modern biography. In truth, however, the public will find here the picture of a remarkable man, drawn with a love, discrimination, and vigour, such as only too seldom meet in literary art.

Mr. Collins's parents were godly people and Methodists. His training was at once Christian and English. His father, in particular, a man of strong mind and intense religious earnestness, not a little original too in some of his educational ideas, took great pains to give a right bent to his son's life and character. The blessing of God made these efforts fruitful. When quite young, he "knew the Scriptures" in the supernatural power of them. Then there were shadows. A moralist could never have descried them; but his parents and Christian friends did, and he felt the chill of them himself. He made his way into the light again. How, the popular theosophy, with its ever bland,

good-natured God, would be aghast to hear. From Mr. Coley we learn that he actually roared for the disquietness of his heart, and as nearly as possible reproduced the conduct of a certain Macedonian gaoler of whom history tells. Nor this in one instance merely, for his youthful religion suffered another check; and it was only after a second spiritual struggle, sorer than the first, that he became the joyful, faithful, devoted, and laborious servant of Christ whom the biography describes. He was now in the spring of manhood, and he began to live to purpose. He made solemn acts of prayer a serious part of the business of every day, and rose early that he might have leisure to perform them. He read solid books in theology and general literature, and assimilated them into his own mental substance. He became an evangelist, and by visiting, teaching, and preaching, often amidst much privation and persecution, endeavoured to benefit others, and purchased for himself a good degree and great boldness in the work to which his life was to be consecrated. In process of time Mr. Collins was led to offer himself to the Methodist Conference as a candidate for the ministry; and for some while he indulged the hope of receiving an appointment as a missionary to the heathen. This latter prospect was blighted; not so the heart which it had melted and gladdened. In place of service abroad, and prior to his being formally recognised as a Methodist minister, Mr. Collins found himself unexpectedly called upon to perform ministerial functions upon ground scarcely less truly missionary than any district of Hindustan or China. He was sent to do what he could to wake into religious life the scattered, neglected, and all but pagan population of those wild moorlands which form the uttermost parts of the county of Northumberland. This was in 1831; and readers who wish to acquaint themselves with contemporary Christian England, or who are at all concerned to know whether the nineteenth century has ever reflected the self-denial and zeal of the first, will do well to study Mr. Coley's picture of what Mr. Collins found in his field of labour, and of what he was and did there as a shepherd of souls. How vicious, brutish, stolid and ignorant the people were; how he yearned over them, prayed for them, argued with them, rebuked them, preached to them as only men on whom the Spirit of God comes know how to preach; how, last of all, his ministry, Paul-like for its journeyings, fastings, fatigues, and manifold physical sufferings, gathered harvests such as Paul would have wept and triumphed over, perhaps would have registered in immortal letters to churches—is impressively and graphically told in the narrative.

Our limits will not allow us to follow Mr. Collins step by step along the course of his ministry. What it was in its beginning, such it continued to be, only with ever ripening power, to its close. His work in Northumberland ended, he was appointed by the Conference to a "Circuit" in Kent, and there, under very different circumstances, led the same holy life and achieved even greater ministerial success than on the Scottish border. His next station, the Orkneys, was another quasi-mission. He wrought it with a missionary's heart, and as at

Wark and Sandhurst, gathered on the spot abundantly those "precious fruits" for which Christian husbandmen not seldom wait in vain. It was while he was battling with the poverty and hardships of his Orkney life, that a new chapter of his personal history opened in his marriage. A lady of gentle birth and of elegant culture from the south of England made him a happy husband by becoming his happy wife, and till within a short time of his own decease, when she was removed by death, filled his home with the blessed sunshine of all womanly and Christian graces. On leaving Orkney, Mr. Collins was appointed to Durham, and so, after the manner of Methodism, he occupied in succession the "stations" of Dudley, Coventry, St. Alban's, Camborne, St. Austell, Bradford in Yorkshire, Sowerby Bridge, Leamington, Pontypool and Bristol. One break of a year or two, caused by illness, occurred during the quarter of a century represented by these names. With this exception, he continued uninterruptedly to exercise a ministry which for all the highest attributes of personal life, of pulpit strength and fidelity, and of pastoral vigilance, tenderness, wisdom, and self-renunciation, may have had its equals, can have hardly ever been surpassed. It is affecting and almost awful to see how all through his public life he talks with God as a man with his friend; how he recognises and labours to satisfy the Divine obligation under which he is laid to care for souls; and with what burning anxiety, what sacred affectionateness, and what admirable tact and patience, he seeks alike, in season and out of season, to further the great ends of the Gospel.

As a preacher, Mr. Collins was of the class to which, either as a stigma or an honorific, the title *Revivalist* is applied in the objectionable dialect of certain modern religionists. What phases of Christian teaching and effort this term may represent, whether in idea or in fact, it is not our business to indicate. Certain it is, that, in the case of Mr. Collins, it could only be justly employed as a synonym for some of the noblest qualities which can mark the minister of Christ. Buffoonery, grotesqueness, rant, extravagance, claptrap, noise for the sake of noise, he hated them from his soul. But these were not his only aversion. He dreaded lethargy in the pulpit. He dreaded trifling and cowardice. To his view the issues at stake were tremendous, and the time was short. He must be in earnest therefore. For him, at least, secondary truth must give place to primary; and whatever was sacrificed, convention, taste, etiquette, prejudice, feeling, all must go rather than an opportunity be missed of putting a fellow-man face to face with God, and his duty, and the life to come, and of helping, as brother may help brother, to guide his feet into the way of peace. So Mr. Collins thought, and so he acted. And though he was often misunderstood, sometimes even suffered abuse for the independence with which he carried out his principles, one thing is manifest from his history—he turned very many to righteousness.

Not that Mr. Collins's preaching was a monotonous ringing of the changes on the great Christian verities, much less was it a hotch-potch of random, loose, and rhapsodical declamation, such as sometimes

comes of the union of a warm heart and a weak and undisciplined intellect. His mind was one of more than average robustness; and from the time of his conversion, it was matter of conscience with him to keep it well cultivated. He mastered the best divinity, ancient and modern. He was no stranger to philosophy, history, science, and *belles lettres*. He studied Hebrew, Greek, and other languages. He had views of his own on many subjects. He was powerful in controversy, though he always disliked it. Mr. Coley quotes the saying of a sceptic: "Thomas Collins is the hardest hitter I ever knew." The memoir abounds with illustrations of the fertility of his intelligence, and of the terseness, force, and beauty with which he was able to express his thoughts in speaking and writing. And his sermons were in keeping with all this natural and acquired strength. Brimming over with tenderness, impatient of rhetorical artifice or embellishment, dealing always with fundamental truth, addressed directly to the reason and conscience of the hearers, they were manly, compact, and forcible discourses, such as men to whom the Gospel means something are always glad to hear, and which only evil-doers, flutterers, and religious babies think themselves justified in despising. It should be added, that Mr. Collins was the last man in the world to assume that his own type of ministerial usefulness was an exclusive one. Nothing is more beautiful than the frank and generous homage which we always see him paying to the conscientiousness, the endowments, and the services of brother ministers, whether in or out of his own denomination, even those who differed widely from himself in certain principles and methods of evangelical action. And yet this will not appear remarkable to those who either knew Mr. Collins personally, or who mark him as he is exhibited in Mr. Coley's truthful and attractive picture. Intensely earnest as he was, both as a Christian and a minister, he was one of the most large-hearted, genial, and human of human kind. He was not one of those religious malformations of which Isaac Taylor speaks—men living upon better terms with angels than with their neighbours and families. He was a man of catholic soul, with an intelligence whose many eyes were open to everything about them, and who carried sunshine with him wherever he went. Censoriousness, jealousy, conceit—they never caught sight of him. Neither did austerity, crabbedness, or any other vice of coarse and vulgar natures. He was full of noble sympathies. He had the instincts of a gentleman. Children loved him. Stars and flowers and shells, he revelled in them all. There was a fine vein of humour in him, and a dash of poetry too. He was fond of rhyming; and now and again his rhymes show that the "fine phrenzy" was not far off. Altogether he was as pure and bright and lovable an example of regenerate, consecrated human nature, as can well be thought of—really one of those "shining ones" who walk the earth and bless and sanctify it, though men's bleared eyes often fail to see their glory. Mr. Coley's painting of Mr. Collins's home life at Hemel-Hempstead, during the forced pause in his ministry occasioned

by his illness, is one of the most charming Christian "interiors" which any recent canvas has portrayed.

And this brings us to speak of the manner in which Mr. Collins's biographer has executed his task. Here, as to all that is principal, there can be but one opinion. Mr. Coley has produced one of the most impressive, attractive, and fascinating religious biographies to be met with in the English language. In profound sympathy with his subject, himself gifted with more than one marked attribute of Mr. Collins's mental constitution, he has written the life of his kinsman with a judgment, a taste, a delicacy, a breadth of view, a force, and a picturesqueness, which all his readers will recognise and admire. A fastidious criticism might complain of an occasional antiqueness and quaintness of style befitting the pulpit of fifty years ago, rather than a popular narrative of contemporary life; and opinions will probably differ as to the discreetness which ruled the introduction of certain special facts and discussions into the memoir. But no one will deny, that subject to qualifications which it is almost hypercritical to hint at, Mr. Coley has written with a wisdom and a grace only equalled by the genius and ability which have given shape to his work.

Apropos of the biographer, one very striking feature of the volume must not pass unnoticed. Mr. Coley appears throughout as a preacher and teacher. Consciously or not, he is perpetually finding pegs in his narrative on which to hang dogma, disquisition, parable, sentiment, anecdote. Nothing comes amiss to him, if it will only dovetail with his theme and his object. Now we have a stiff piece of theological argument, or a withering satire on some religious folly or impertinence. Now the assumptions of modern Anglicanism are put into the crucible, or reason is shown why Church differences should not sunder Christian affection. Now the worship of political expediency, or the moral character of the *Times* newspaper, is made the subject of brief but elaborate discussion. Now, again, some story of ancient or modern date is told, which thrills one with awe, or wakes into activity the genius of mirth and laughter. Some readers will fancy they hear an *ex cathedra* tone in much of this. Not a few, perhaps, will think that there is too much the appearance of bringing in passages for their own sake, and that so the memoir becomes, at certain points, a mosaic, rather than a fabric. How far such impressions may be sound, we will not take upon us to say. Supposing Mr. Coley to have violated the canons of literary composition in the respects we have suggested, we only hope that all other transgressors will go wrong with equal advantage to their readers.

Take the following remarks upon that not uncommon abuse of the Gospel, which makes human salvation to hinge literally upon confessing with the mouth the Lord Jesus:—

"Oh! this salvation by syllogism is a delusion. 'Jesus died for me,' minified into the mere premiss of an argument in an impenitent lip, is as worthless as any shibboleth bigot ever framed. Precious truths so held are in *mortmain* and are harvestless as seed-corn in a mummy's

hand. Thousands can get through the narrow steps of that poor mental exercise only to realise that in its bosom lies a sophism, and that its conclusion is a lie."

Or the following, touching a class of ministers from whose presence most Christian Churches of any years' life have suffered blight:—

"On the other hand, one has known men—respectably frosty men—inanities, that never missed an aspirate, and never smote a conscience; men, feebly elegant; too impotent to think for the age, and too genteel to work for it; too unimportant to guide its clergy, and too listless to move its people. The contempt with which these ciphers in orders—who must be excused from saving souls because they have to polish sentences—look down upon the earnest evangelists as only 'noisy revivalists' is a small matter, not further to be noticed; assuredly not generated in its subjects by any plethora of brain."

Or once more, hear what he says on "Expedience":—

"Honest convictions—unlike policy—will not swerve. No doubt, on questions of right, faith stiffens a man. Talleyrand's 'No prejudices,' in English unadorned, mostly likely, would be called, 'No principles.' Such facile, supple men, however, have but fading fame. They are but men of their time, not men for all time. Their souls' eyes have but a half-inch focus; their boasted practical sense is but a glow-worm light, irradiating what it can touch, but leaving the deep infinity of surrounding space in midnight. Clever, in their own days, at *wriggling through*, their memory—married to nothing eternal—perishes."

We are tempted to quote some anecdotes. We must content ourselves with one, and this not the biographer's, but Mr. Collins's own. It illustrates more than one feature of his sterling and beautiful character. Writing of a day in October, 1852, he says:—

"On Monday I went a pilgrimage to Elstow to see the birthplace of Bunyan. The house has been rebuilt. We entered the cottage that occupies the site; it is small, having but one lower and one upper room, with a pantry under the stairs. A strong old beam is the only remnant of the original cot. In consideration of a gratuity, we were permitted to take some small splinters for my relic-loving friends. While my companion got them, I said to the woman, 'That timber is from an ancient tree; but I know of an older, it is called the tree of life.' 'Indeed,' she replied, 'I never heard of such a tree.' 'Never heard of it?' I said. 'A well-known book tells of it; the first part of which was written by a man whose name was Moses; one David also added another part. Do you know that book?' 'Well, I'm no scholar, Sir. I can't read, so I don't know anything about books.' This ignorance of the Bible, and, of all places on earth, in John Bunyan's cottage, astonished me. On leaving, in the street we met a grey-haired man; wishing, if I might, to gather up any floating local traditions, I accosted him. 'Old friend,' said I, 'we have come a long way this morning to look at the birthplace of one John Bunyan, who was born in these parts. Do you know anything about him?' 'What was he, Sir?' 'Well, they tell me that he was a great preacher.' 'A



*preacher! I know nothing about such as them. I goes to church.* Thinking I might speak with the man of Jesus, though I had failed concerning John, I asked, 'Do you know the Head of the Church?' 'The Head of the Church,' he repeated inquiringly, 'The Head of the Church? It must be old Whitbread, sure enough.' 'What? a brewer the head of the Church?' 'Must be him, sir; *he owns all the parish!*' Passing on, I tried another venerable-looking villager, 'Do you know anything of John Bunyan?' 'I've heard of him.' 'What have you heard?' 'Well, they tell me that he was oft in jail.' 'Oft in jail? Why, how was that? Did he poach the quality's game? or did he knock people on the head in the highway? or what?' 'Well, sir, I can't say; but they do say he was oft in jail.' "

We take it for granted, that no Methodist minister will leave this book unread. We wish every Christian minister throughout the world, whatever his denomination, could read it. It is possible that beyond the pale of Methodism its acceptableness may be prejudiced to some extent by its distinctively Methodist air and language. Nor are we sure that even within that pale there may not be those who will scruple the teaching of the volume on a single point of doctrine. How far Scripture and the nature of things will sustain the view under which the commencement of a perfect, as distinguished from an imperfect, Christian life is usually exhibited in Mr. Coley's work, it is not for us to pronounce. Believing as we do most thoroughly, both in the possibility and in the religious obligation of an absolute consecration to Christ on the part of His disciples, we could not ourselves, without liberal paraphrase, accept the terms in which Mr. Collins and his biographer agree to speak on this subject; and we anticipate that a considerable number of Mr. Coley's readers will be sensible of a like hesitation. With men of large soul, however, all this will be as nothing compared with the galaxy of excellences, both in substance and form, which here offers itself to the admiration and gratitude of the churches: and we pity the reader, whatever his Christian creed or ecclesiastical relations, who does not put down this volume with a quickened faith in the Gospel, and an abundantly heightened solicitude for its progress and supremacy in the world. The subject of Mr. Coley's biography is lifted far above the encomiums of men. It was worth being born to be the writer of it. Blessed be the Christian communities, be they great or small, whose ministers are animated by a spirit and honoured with an evangelical success like that of Thomas Collins!

The Revelation of Law in Scripture considered with Respect both to its own Nature, and to its Relative Place in Successive Dispensations. The Third Series of "The Cunningham Lectures." By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1869.

WE have read these lectures with much satisfaction, and think them on the whole the best series of the energetic "Cunningham Lectures."

To the readers of Dr. Fairbairn's previous works there will be found very much that is positively new; but those who have not yet made his acquaintance as a theologian, will, we venture to think, place him very high, whether as it regards theological acumen, or candour and dignity of spirit. We are always conscious of the guidance of a master, and of one who is too deeply imbued with Christian grace to display the rancorous tone too common in the treatment of such themes as occupy his book.

The first lecture deals with the most prominent of all the questions which philosophy propounds to religion, or that are common to what is called philosophy and theology. It considers what is meant by law, and what views are entertained as to the ascendancy of law in the physical and moral universe. Among the first sentences is this striking one: "An indissoluble chain of sequences, the fixed and immutable law of cause and effect, whether always discoverable or not, is contemplated as blending together the order of events in the *natural* world; but as regards the *spiritual*, it is the inherent right or sovereignty of the individual mind that is chiefly made account of, subject only to the claims of social order, the temporal interests of humanity, and the general enlightenment of the times." The lecturer ably indicates the existence of a supreme personal will, of which law must be an expression, and lays down the "landmarks which the Bible itself sets up, and the measure of the liberty it accords to the cultivators of science." First, the strict and proper personality of God; secondly, the domain of natural science is presupposed rather than made the object of express revelation; thirdly—and this is a point we think of supreme importance, not enough regarded generally, but dwelt upon here with emphasis worthy—that "free play is allowed to general laws and natural agencies or to the operation of cause and effect; and this, not merely as bearing on simply natural results, but also as connected with spiritual relations and duties. Those laws and agencies are of God; as briefly expressed by Augustine, 'God's will constitutes the nature of things' (*Dei voluntas rerum natura est*), or more fully by Hooker, 'that law, the performance whereby we behold in things natural, is as it were an authentic or original draft written in the bosom of God Himself, whose Spirit being to execute the same with every particular nature, every mere natural agent is only as an instrument created at the beginning, and ever since the beginning used, to work His own will and pleasure withal. Nature, therefore, is nothing else but God's instrument. Whence the various powers and faculties of nature, whether in things animate or inanimate, her regular course and modes of procedure, are not supplanted by grace, but are recognised and acted upon to the full extent that they can be made subservient to higher purposes. Thus, when, in respect to things above nature, God reveals His mind to men, He does it through men, and through men not as mere machines unconsciously obeying a supernatural impulse, but acting in discharge of their personal obligations and the free exercise of their individual powers and susceptibilities." It may be felt by some that here there is a certain neglect,

either cautious or contemptuous, of philosophical theories so called; we, for our own part, think that the lecturer deals precisely as a Christian theologian should deal with the whole question. "Mind in man is capable of originating a force which within definite limits can suspend the laws of material nature, and control or modify them to its desired ends. And why, then, should it be thought incredible or strange, that the central mind of the universe, by whom all subsists, should at certain special moments, when the purposes of His moral government require a new order of things to be originated, authoritative indications of His will to be given, or results accomplished unattainable in the ordinary course of nature, bring into play a force adequate to the end in view? It is merely supposing the great primary cause interposing to do in a higher line of things what finite beings are ever doing in a lower."

Still more interesting is the discussion of the tendency of thought in the current philosophy of the day, as to law in the moral and religious sphere. Several aspects of their relation to Scripture are treated; that of the Materialists, the Ideal Pantheists, the Christian Idealists, the Neonomianists, and the Antinomians. From the general consideration of these relations, which opens up a most useful glance into the state of modern opinion, the lecturer then turns to the relation of primeval man to the moral law, as a revelation within him, as the test of his rectitude, and the measure of his fall. Then he passes to the law proper and its definite promulgation; its form and substance, and its more essential characteristic. Then comes the position and calling of Israel as placed under the covenant of law, with an excellent exposure of prevalent misunderstanding on this subject. We direct especial attention to the elaborate and exhaustive lecture on the Decalogue, and the relation borne to it by the detached and peculiar statutes of the Jewish Code. But it is when the seventh lecture brings us to the relation of the law to the mission and work of Christ, that we feel ourselves entering upon original ground. The attitude assumed by our Lord to the ceremonial law, and the very different position He assumed to the moral law, are well exhibited. On one most important point we must offer another short quotation: "After so solemnly asserting His entire harmony with the law and the prophets, and His dependence on them, it would manifestly have been to lay Himself open to the charge of inconsistency, and actually to shift the ground which He professedly occupied in regard to them, if now He should go on to declare that, in respect to the great landmarks of moral and religious duty, they said one thing and He said another. This is utterly incredible; and we must assume that, in every instance when a precept of the law is quoted among the things said on former times, even though no improper addition is coupled with it (as in vers. twenty-seven and thirty-three), there still was an unwarrantable or quite inadequate view commonly taken by them, against which our Lord directs His authoritative deliverance, that He might point the way to the proper height of spiritual attainment. This view, which the very nature of the case may be said to demand, is also confirmed by the formula with which the sayings in

question are introduced, 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time' (*ταῖς ἀρχαίαις*, the ancients). . . . It is of the law as thus unduly curtailed, evacuated of its proper meaning, treated by the scribes, or letter-men, as itself but a letter, that Christ speaks, and, setting His profound and far-reaching view in opposition to them, proclaims, 'But I say unto you.' Never on any occasion did Jesus place Himself in such antagonism to Moses; and least of all could He do so here, immediately after having so emphatically repudiated the notion that He had come to nullify the law and the prophets, or to cancel men's obligations to any part of the righteousness they inculcated."

This subject must needs bring the lecturer to the cross; and, instead of analysing the course of the disquisition on Christ living under the law as perfect man, we will quote a fine sentence which says everything:—"In the great conflict of life, in the grand struggle which is proceeding in our own bosoms and in the world around us, between sin and righteousness, the consciousness of guilt and the desire of salvation, it is not in such a mystified, impalpable gospel as those fine-spun theories present to us, that any effective aid is to be found. We must have a solid foundation for our feet to stand upon, a sure and living ground for our confidence before God, and this we can find only in the old Church view of the sufferings and death of Christ as a satisfaction to God's justice for the offence done by our sin to His violated law. Satisfaction, I say emphatically, to *God's justice*, which some, even evangelical, writers seem disposed to stumble at; they would say satisfaction to God's honour, indeed, but by no means to God's justice. What then, I ask, is God's honour apart from His justice?"

The eighth and ninth lectures, on the Relation of Law to the Constitution, Privileges and Calling of the Christian Church, and on the Reintroduction of the Law, in the sense in which law was abolished by Christ and His Apostles, into the Christian Church, will repay careful reading, but will not be found to meet the full demands of the question in itself, or of the controversies that rise out of it in the present day. The volume has a few supplementary essays, and a series of expositions on some important passages on the law in St. Paul's epistles. These expositions many readers, especially those who are familiar with Mr. Jewell's commentaries, will think the most valuable part of the book. We regret that we have been able only to offer a disjointed notice of this able, seasonable and high-toned volume, one among the few for which we desire a thorough reading. Like every other production of Dr. Fairbairn's industry, it will be found faithful to those high principles which are most assaulted in this age; and the student (for the reader must be a student) will rise from it more sure of "the certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed."

The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century; being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Non-juring Bishops; with an Introduction on various Projects of Re-union between the Eastern Church and Anglican Communion. By G. Williams, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1868.

Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church. By H. C. Romanoff. With a Preface by the Author of the "Heir of Redclyffe." London: Rivingtons.

L'Eglise de Russie, par L. Boissard, Pasteur à Glay, près Montbéliard. 2 Tomes. Paris: Cherbuliez. 1867.

THE preparations for the great Œcumenical Council have brought into prominence the Eastern Church, with its eternal protest against Rome, and its supposed affinities with Protestantism. Our own Pan-Anglican Synod has tended also to turn the attention of those who study ecclesiastical principles towards the Christian East; and we believe that a deeper acquaintance with the "Orthodox Greek Church" would tend to add greatly, were that necessary, to our armoury, offensive and defensive, against Rome: whilst it would enlarge our views of the history and development of the Christian Church in a direction where the narrowness of our studies has been only too conspicuous. There is scarcely a single department of Church history about which theological students are more slightly informed. Hence, such works as those we have mentioned above are very seasonable, and well worth careful reading; they are also exceedingly interesting, and make the subject as agreeable as it can possibly be made.

The first of them is valuable as a book of reference, registering and rendering accessible a variety of important documents that refer to sundry efforts made in past times to realise that dream of union between the Eastern Church and Anglicanism, which has always haunted the minds of High Churchmen. The book, as a whole, must have, on every honest mind under that fascination, a very disenchanting effect. The persons we refer to are indicated in the following sentences from Miss Yonge's Preface to Madame Romanoff's straightforward book: "In the memory of many of us, the Greek Church was almost ignored. There were numerous persons who divided Christendom into Protestants and Roman Catholics, and supposed all the former to have the truth, all the latter to be in error; and if the existence of Eastern Christians were pressed on them, would have classed them as a more ignorant and debased species of Roman Catholics. Clearer knowledge has, however, dawned on us. We have become accustomed to regard foreign communions with more discrimination and more candour. The prayers for unity, which have so long been repeated with the most vague and undefined sense of what was therein asked, seem at last to be so answered, that there is a certain heaving and

moving in the dissevered fragments, almost a yearning to be one again, and even a few absolute efforts which, though as yet uncertain and spasmodic, may yet, under God's grace, lead to something more definite and more authoritative." Illustrations of theological doctrines and ecclesiastical principles by tales are not generally to be recommended; and we are by no means disposed to make an exception in favour of what comes from Miss Yonge's pen. But this book, as a picture of the onward working of spiritual life in the modern Greek Church, is of real and most pathetic interest.

But it is to the work of Pasteur Boissard that we desire to point attention. Here is a history of the Greek Church in Russia, with a view of its doctrines, and an estimate of its work and destiny in the world, written by a Protestant of large heart, catholic views, and special sympathy with "Holy Russia." His work, written in beautiful French, will amply repay the care it will require. As we hope to present a completer view of it in due time, we shall content ourselves now with a few sentences from the preface, which will be found eminently suggestive with reference to the arrogant claims of Rome and the too sanguine hopes of Protestants. "The Russian Church, whose destiny through the ages we have endeavoured in these pages to trace, seems to have received from Providence a special mission in the work of the religious development of humanity. After that Jerusalem, the land of promise, had swiftly lost the supremacy which belonged to her as the cradle of the Christian churches, Constantinople, heiress of her influence, projected on the Christian East the rays of a vivid light. Through the care of her patriarchs, the profound idolatry of the countries in the north of Europe had given place to the reign of the Gospel. And when, in her turn, new Rome had disappeared before the wave of Mussulman invasion, a mighty empire, brought in the tenth century to the knowledge of the Evangelical faith, received the deposit of the persecuted Church, and protected under the domes of her sanctuaries the doctrine, the traditions, the discipline, and the worship of the first ages of Christianity, which the chair of Constantinople had confided to her fidelity." Here we must suspend our quotation, and suggest that long before the tenth century and the conversion of the Scythian people, the chair of Constantinople had allowed the Christian worship and discipline, and the Christian truth itself, in many respects, to receive many and flagrant corruptions. Hence, in what follows there must be considerable deduction made. "If antiquity of faith may be invoked in favour of truth of doctrine, this privilege belongs to the Oriental Church. It is a remarkable fact, that this Church, after all the vicissitudes through which she has been called to pass, and the hardships she has had to encounter, proclaims, of herself, that she has remained faithful to her confession, that she has preserved, without change, the doctrine of the Apostles, and the decisions of the seven oecumenical councils. When the relation between her and Rome was consummated, under the patriarchate of Photius, it was in vain that Rome used every artifice to bring her back under the universal empire



that she assumed to wield over Christendom; in vain the great movement of the Crusades was directed against the Greek Church rather than against the usurpers of the holy places; in vain, the councils of Lyons and Florence, convened less with a conciliatory design, than in the interests of a determined policy, pronounced the problematic fusion of the two great Christian communions. The Oriental Church, whatever may have been the rents and transformations it has successively undergone, rests firm upon its foundation, and its future, in the judgment of human prevision, seems not to be less assured than that of Rome." This we can admit; for, as surely as the Word of God is true, both are alike doomed as representatives of the kingdom of Christ to subversion. But let us hear the best case that can be made out for the Greek communion as against the Roman.

"Is it said that the rupture with the West has condemned the Eastern Church to isolation, or that she has defiled, in her bosom, the source of vital strength that results from the harmony of the whole body? If we throw a glance over the parallel development of the two Churches, we remark at the outset that the great schism was, for that of the East a rampart raised up against very many dangers. It preserved her from the spiritual despotism and the dogmatic or disciplinary innovations to which her rival has been far from a stranger; from those alterations of doctrine and deviations from morals that inflicted upon the Roman Church the fruitful protest of the sixteenth century; from the celibacy of the priesthood, which, while it doubtless makes the clergy a militant army in the service of the Papacy, contributes a permanent and deadly peril to purity of life and morals; from the sacrilegious commerce in indulgences which obliterates the human conscience; from the horrors of the Inquisition, that odious infraction of the imprescriptable right of religious liberty; finally, from the discredit that, in the present day, attaches to a weapon formerly redoubtable, which Rome now hesitates to use—the power of excommunication." This is very strikingly put, and honestly makes the enormous advantage which severance from Rome has been to the Greek Church. "In these diverse points of view the great schism, far from having been an obstacle to the progress of Christianity, seems to us to have efficiently served the cause of the Gospel. Living for long ages by her own life, the Church of the East has been able to repudiate the errors of Rome, who, monopolising to her own profit the Holy Scriptures, proclaims that to her alone pertains the right of presenting the faith to the peoples of the earth. The Oriental Communion places everywhere, and, above all things, the sovereign authority of the sacred Scriptures themselves. She favours and stimulates the reading of them by the faithful. Whilst others hinder men from drawing at this Divine source of the knowledge of duty and of truth, she digs for it new channels by the dissemination of biblical translations in the vulgar tongue. She invites all her members to make, of the sacred books, the daily aliment of their moral and religious needs. Here is a mighty force, and a strong guarantee for

the truth; to be the pure reflection of the Word of God is, for every church, to partake of its infallibility."

We must examine, at some length, the Greek confessions of faith, and watch their ceremonies in their pictured and bespangled churches, before we can decide how perfectly this Oriental Communion reflects the pure Word of God. To our mind it is but a very distorted reflection indeed. Meanwhile, we must quote, for their interest and eloquence, some final words: "Disseminated from the borders of the Adriatic Sea to the distant edges of the Oriental Ocean and America, from the ice that surrounds the monastery of Solovetz, on the banks of the White Sea, to the burning plains of Egypt and Arabia, where the Convent of Sinai lifts its head, the Eastern Church, and its principal branch, the Russian Church, offer to the meditation of the historian pages full of interest, high lessons of virtue, and noble traditions of Christian heroism. From it have passed men of faith, courageous missionaries, martyrs and confessors of Jesus Christ. When, ascending the current of ages, we fix our attentive regard on the ancient Kief, cradle of the Roman faith, or on the 'holy' city of Moscow, first centre of its orthodoxy; when we contemplate, with an admiration filled with respect, the noble traits of pastors such as Cyril, Nixon, Philip, Hermogenes, Philarete; of pious ascetics such as Antony, Theodorus, Sergius, Sozimus; of princes like Vladimir, Monomachus, Alexander Newsky, Michael Romanoff; of such a multitude of martyrs and confessors of every age, sex, and condition; the study of the Russian Church, which is the object of the present work, viewed under the several aspects of her missions, hierarchy, dogma, dissenting parties, polemics, Christian life, monastic and literary activity, will be found to present elements of the highest order of interest, especially in the present day, when questions of religion and religious history enforce the attention of every serious mind." Not long hence we shall show more fully in what way our enthusiastic author accomplishes his purpose. Meanwhile, we recommend these untranslated volumes to our French-reading students of ecclesiastical history.

An Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. H. W. Williams, Author of "The Incarnate Son of God," "Union with Christ," &c. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1869.

THIS is the production of a sound scholar, a reverent Christian, and an accurate theologian. Many readers of Mr. Williams' former writings, aware that his mind has been occupied for some years on this Epistle, have waited for the result with deep interest. They will not be disappointed; as, tested by its standard and aim, the work is one of uniform and sustained excellence. The author has prescribed to himself a rigid plan, which he has pursued from beginning to end with undeviating simplicity of purpose. His commentary is not a critical

one, whether as respects the text or its interpretation; but it never neglects the grammar of the Greek Testament, or the light thrown upon the meaning by occasional various readings. Discussion of controverted doctrines, and the various theories of sin, redemption, and salvation, which have made the Epistle to the Romans their favourite battle-ground, are almost entirely left out of consideration. This will be regarded by many as a grave defect; but for our own part we remember how large is the number of devout readers and students who prefer to study polemics elsewhere than in the pages of a commentary, and to whom the tranquil faith and perfect repose of these pages will be inexpressibly refreshing. The unfolding of St. Paul's meaning, as St. Paul was the organ of the Holy Ghost, is the supreme object; and it is pursued with a fidelity that is proof against every temptation, and with a temperance in diction that scarcely allows a needless sentence in the volume, and even very few words that might be challenged.

As Mr. Williams' theology is our theology, we shall not do more than express our cordial acceptance of the book as a whole. Indeed, it is issued under auspices that protect it from criticism as an exponent of theological sentiment. As to those minor points of exegetical subtlety which allow considerable range of diversity in interpretation, we have our differences with the author—differences, however, which we would rather discuss in private colloquy, than in the pages of a literary journal. For instance, some points in the very admirable and lucid Introduction, and the general theory of the Destiny of the Creation, we should be disposed to controvert. We should, also, plead for a much fuller and deeper exposition of some of the Apostle's grand keynotes, such as that in Rom. xiii. 10. But we have no disposition to qualify in the least the hearty welcome we give to this excellent specimen of thorough Methodist exposition and theology. We may presume that our readers for the most part will be readers of this volume: they will need no extracts. For the sake of many others, we shall insert a brief specimen, first of Mr. Williams' method of running analysis, and then of his detailed exposition: premising only that we take the friendly liberty of chasing all the italics out of the composition.

#### “CHAPTER III. GENERAL OUTLINE.

“St. Paul had now established the principle that every man will be ultimately dealt with by God according to his personal character, and that an outward church-relation to Him will not shelter any one who loves and practises sin. His way was thus open to the conclusion which he sought to reach—that the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, were guilty before God, and exposed to His righteous displeasure. But he pauses in his general argument to meet some difficulties, and answer some objections, which his preceding reasonings might call forth in the Jewish mind. He maintains that, notwithstanding the principle which he had affirmed, the position of the race of Israel, under the former economy, did involve great religious advantages; and he specifies, as pre-eminent among them, the position of the written revelation with

its promises of blessing. He contends, further, that the faithfulness of God to His engagements will be distinctly manifested, even though individuals fail of attaining the blessings held forth to them, through their own unbelief and perverseness. Then he comes to the conclusion of this section of his argument—that, inasmuch as Jews and Gentiles are *all under sin*, justification by the deeds of the law is impossible, and nothing remains to man but to take his place as confessedly guilty before God.

“And now he proceeds to unfold, in glowing and impressive language, *the righteousness of God*—that righteousness which He imputes to man according to His scheme of grace in Christ Jesus. Indications of a plan of gratuitous justification through a Mediator, and that justification to be received by faith, had, he affirms, been given in the ancient Scriptures; but, under the Gospel, the Divine method of justification is fully disclosed and openly proclaimed. This righteousness, which is offered to all men, without exception, upon their believing in the Lord Jesus, rests upon the redemption which He has wrought out. His death, the Apostle assures us, is the propitiatory offering designed in the counsels of the eternal Father, and now set forth as the object of our trust; and through His vicarious suffering the essential righteousness of God is maintained and manifested, even while He justifies the returning sinner that believes in Jesus. The excellence of this method of justification is then dwelt upon. The Apostle affirms, in a tone of exulting confidence, that it strikes at the root of the pride so fondly cherished by our depraved nature—that it is adapted to the necessities of all mankind, and evinces the regard of God to all—and that it upholds the declarations of the ancient revelation, while it establishes the moral law, and provides for its being obeyed in spirit and in truth.”

In this style of general analysis the train of thought is exhibited throughout. We shall now quote part of the comment on ver. 21, in this same section.

“Ver. 21. *But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.* . . . Different explanations have been given of the phrase, ‘the righteousness of God;’ but the precise shade of meaning which it is designed to present is sufficiently indicated by the connection in which it occurs. It refers, clearly, not to the attribute of righteousness as belonging to God Himself, but to righteousness considered as imputed to man, in opposition to a state of condemnation; and it is designed to fix our attention on the truth, that this righteousness is now imputed to us according to that scheme of constitution which God has established, and which He recognises in the moral administration of this world. This righteousness is ‘without the law;’ it is a righteousness which becomes ours independently of the law, and notwithstanding that we have failed to obey its precepts. For it rests, as the Apostle goes on to show, upon a different ground, the atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus, which faith appropriates, and in which it secures a personal

interest. This 'righteousness of God,' the Apostle affirms, 'is now manifest;' it is brought out, under the present economy, into the clearest light, and held forth to the attainment of all, however guilty, who fly in penitence and faith to the appointed refuge. Intimations of this scheme of grace had indeed been given in the former announcements of God to man, and the whole series of the Divine dispensations had, in an important sense, borne witness to it; but now only was it clearly unfolded and distinctly proclaimed. We have already seen how deep an interest this sentiment had called forth in the mind of St. Paul. Even in the opening of this Epistle, on the very first mention of 'the Gospel of God,' he adds, 'which He had promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures;' and now, when about to explain at length 'the righteousness of God,' the ground on which it rests, and the blessings which it involves, he affirms that, while its manifestation belongs to the present economy, it had been 'witnessed by the law and the prophets.' A full development of this thought would exceed the limits of a note, but we may properly advert to a few of the intimations of the Divine scheme of grace which are found in the ancient Scriptures. The rite of sacrifice, introduced immediately after the Fall, and afterwards more fully developed, opened to guilty man a new way of approach to God, and carried forward the thoughtful mind to a greater sacrifice that should, in the fulness of time, be presented. The patriarch Abraham, as St. Paul argues at length in the following chapter, was accounted righteous through his faith in the covenant engagements of God; and the declarations of God to him on which his descendants loved to dwell—the declarations which pointed out the Messiah as the source of blessing to mankind—could in no way be so distinctly fulfilled as by the free offer of pardon and eternal life to men upon their believing in Him. Successive prophets gave forth announcements of rich and deep import, relative to the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah, and the justification which should result from them to all who should confide in them. We may recall, in particular, the words of Isaiah in ch. liii. . . . We may refer also to the announcement of God by Jeremiah, ch. xxiii. 5, 6. . . . Equally impressive is the message which Gabriel conveyed to the prophet Daniel: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy cities, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy" (Dan. ix. 24). But these passages, in which righteousness is expressly mentioned as flowing to man through the suffering but exalted Saviour, are not the only ones which the Apostle had in view." . . .

We must close this brief notice by once more expressing our thankfulness for this addition to Methodist theology, and by recommending it to our readers as a safe guide in their study, and as a profitable companion to their devotion.

Biographical Sketches. By Harriet Martineau. London: Macmillan and Co. 1869.

THIS volume is a reproduction, in a convenient form, of a series of sketches contributed to the *Daily News* since 1852. It was suggested to the writer of them that many readers might wish to have them in a more accessible form than when hidden in the files of a newspaper; and the gentleman who made the suggestion—one of the conductors of the journal in which they first appeared—took upon himself the trouble and responsibility of the republication. Many of Miss Martineau's readers will regret to learn from her own words, in the brief preface to this volume, that her state of health renders all literary exertion impossible, so that the mere arrangement of the material is all that she has permitted herself to contribute to the reappearance of these sketches. They therefore remain just as they were written. "In the few which relate to persons then living, there may be sentences or expressions which would have been different if the memoirs were to be written now; but to alter these now would be to tamper with the truth of the sketch and to produce something more misleading than the forecasts of a time long gone by." In the case of those which relate to persons then dead—about nine-tenths of the whole—as the impression they convey was made of the completed life in each case, and was final, the first record of it remains untouched in order to remain faithful. They are therefore left "to produce their own impression, whether on the minds of those who from peculiar knowledge carry a corresponding picture in their own breasts, or of those to whom the personages were historical while they lived. The records are true to my own impressions, and, secure in this main particular, I have no misgiving in offering them to readers whose curiosity and interest about the distinguished dead of their time claim such satisfaction as any survivor may be able to give."

The sketches are forty-six in number, the earliest being that of Miss Berry, November, 1852, and the latest that of Lord Brougham, May, 1868. They are grouped together under six classes—Royal, Politicians, Professional, Scientific, Social and Literary; and as it is utterly impossible within the necessary limits of a notice like this to remark the treatment of the subject in each case, it may be well to mention the names of the personages who are successively portrayed and judged. This will, at the same time, serve to indicate something of the character of the book. The "Royal" personages are the Emperor Nicholas, Metternich, the Duchess of Gloucester, King Frederick William IV. of Prussia, and the Duchess of Kent. As "Politicians" we have the Marquis of Anglesey, Joseph Hume, Lord Murray, Lord Herbert of Lea, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Lyndhurst, the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Carlisle, Lord Palmerston, Lord Brougham. Under the class "Professional" are ranged Bishop Blomfield, Archbishop Whately, the Marquis of Londonderry, Lord Raglan, the Napiers, Lieut.-Gen. Sir William Napier, Rear-



Admiral Sir Francis Beaufort, Sir John Richardson, Lord Denman, Lord Chancellor Campbell, David Roberts, R.A. The "Scientific" group comprises only two names—George Combe and Alexander Von Humboldt. The "Social" characters are Miss Berry, Father Matthew, Robert Owen, Lady Noel Byron. The fourteen "Literary" notabilities are Amelia Opie, Professor Wilson (Christopher-North), John Gibson Lockhart, Mary Russel Mitford, Charlotte Brontë, Samuel Rogers, John Wilson Croker, Mrs. Marcet, Henry Hallam, Mrs. Wordsworth, Thomas De Quincey, Lord Macaulay, Mrs. Jamieson, Walter Savage Landor. It will be seen that within each class the order of succession is that in which the notices were written—an order determined in most cases by the date of the death of the various persons.

The experiment of reprinting newspaper articles is often an unfortunate one. Unless there are more solid and enduring merits than that of freshness—which is necessarily sacrificed—it is sure to be so. But in the case of this volume far more than in the *Letters from Ireland*, which were reprinted from the *Daily News* in 1852, there would be cause for regret if its contents had not been republished in this form. The list of subjects which has been given above makes it unnecessary to say that they are interesting; but the treatment of them constitutes the charm of the book. Nothing is more striking about it than the fact that the opinions expressed in many of these sketches, written immediately after the death of the persons whom they describe, have gradually become the generally accepted opinions of society about them, although when they were first stated they must, in some cases, have appeared too exacting in their requirements, too moderate in praise, and too stern in judgment. The reason is probably to be found in the fact that they were originally formed with constant regard to a high moral standard of political, social, and literary excellence, and that the rare consistency of the writer yielded less than is usually the case to the first unreasoning impulses to praise, and pity, and palliation, which sometimes makes the maxim, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, as unfair critically as it is weakening to the moral sense. Where so many characters are passed under review it is almost impossible that anyone of independent judgment can agree with all the sentences pronounced; but there is an admirable fairness in all Miss Martineau's portraits. The most serious fault of many sketches is their brevity. A kindly sarcasm gives zest to some of them—for example, those of Lord Campbell and the Marquis of Londonderry. The notice of Lady Noel Byron will have a particular attraction for many just now, when the question of the causes of her separation from her husband are once more being agitated. Several passages in the volume might be quoted to illustrate its clear, vigorous, and incisive style. The picture of the Czar Nicholas in his loneliness and disappointment on his last birthday is noticeable. One remarks, without drawing any conclusion from it, that the female characters are sketched with more softness than those of the other sex, with more sympathy perhaps, and greater leniency. It may be added, in conclu-

sion, that to many people this book would give quite as much information about its subjects as they would acquire by abstracting it for themselves from other and far more voluminous sources.

**Her Majesty's Tower.** By William Hepworth Dixon. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1869.

WE do not wonder that this book has already reached a fourth edition. The intrinsic interest of the subject, the well known powers of the author, and the prestige of a dedication to the Queen "by express permission," are certain to command a large circle of readers. But the work will not enhance the literary reputation of the writer. We are not at all insensible to Mr. Hepworth Dixon's talents. He has a rare mastery of the English language, a wonderful faculty of description, and a mind of no ordinary culture and information. He has capacity enough for winning a distinguished position among standard authors, especially in the department of history. But instead of cultivating his powers in this direction, he has for some time yielded to the fascinations of a transient popularity, and frittered away his great abilities in order to secure immediate but ephemeral effect. He has gone with that tide of sensational writing which threatens to swamp the literary reputation of the age. Evidences of this tendency in his writings may be seen in his *Lord Bacon*, a work, undoubtedly, of considerable research, but one in which historical accuracy is sacrificed over and over again to vigorous and telling expression. The same vice exhibits itself, though under a slightly different aspect, in his *Holy Land*; the critical value of which is most seriously lessened by broad generalisations, and by a florid phraseology fatal to that exactness to fact which must distinguish a work of the kind if it is to be at all trustworthy. His volumes on *New America* were yet more faulty in this respect. Regarded merely as the contributions of a "special correspondent," the brilliant chapters of that work were almost incomparable. Their dash, their vigour, their graphic power, secured for the author a reputation as wide as civilisation. But as records of travel, or as a permanent contribution to our knowledge of the actual life of the people delineated, no one would think of quoting them, or attaching to them any standard value. *New America*, which, with the author's opportunities and resources, might have been a standard work, was simply a book "for the season," to be eagerly demanded by Mudie's subscribers while the rage was "on," as they say in America, to figure in the clearance list of the next year at an absurdly insignificant price, and then to vanish altogether and for ever.

The popularity of *New America* hurried Mr. Dixon on to the perpetration (for this is the proper term) of that unhealthy and objectionable book, *Spiritual Wives*, a work of which we have nothing further to say than to express our satisfaction that it belongs to the past, and that it is not likely to have any revival, save in some future catalogue of "literary transgressions." *Her Majesty's Tower* is not an objectionable book, certainly. It may be read in any circle and by any age. But it

is open to the charge of sensationalism as fairly as any of Mr. Dixon's works. It is written throughout in the style of the magazine. Almost every page has its blemish. As an example of this viciousness of style, we may quote from the record of the execution of Lord Hastings at the instigation of Gloucester. "At a sign from Gloucester, bands of soldiers rushed from the corridor, tore Hastings from the table, dragged him downstairs, and, finding the block on the green out of order, threw him across a beam of wood, and hacked off his head." In point of fact, they beheaded him. The ill-fated Margaret of Salisbury is said to have been *hacked to pieces*. It is true that she was severely wounded by the executioner in her vigorous resistance; but Mr. Dixon's expression is historically incorrect. In the same florid style he tells the story of Madge Cheyne's death at the stake. "Her passionate life was licked up by the flames." The very title of the book is sensational; and it fails to indicate the contents. Surely, a more correct title might have been chosen for "a book of identification," intended to throw "light into the cells once occupied by the heroes and heroines of English story."

Passing from the style of the book to its contents, we can speak in less qualified terms. The information given as to the Tower itself is somewhat scanty, and not altogether fresh. Indeed, little more is furnished than may be obtained by reference to guide-books. A few popular fallacies are indicated, and all sight-seers will be disappointed to learn that the gloomy room, traditionally pointed out as the prison of Sir Walter Raleigh, was never occupied by that martyr to foreign intrigue. Some very interesting particulars are given as to prison rules, and the scale of allowances. The age of the Tower is indicated in Mr. Dixon's happiest style:—

"Even as to length of days, the Tower has no rival among palaces and prisons; its origin, like that of the Iliad, that of the Sphinx, that of the Newton Stone, being lost in the nebulous ages, long before our definite history took shape. Old writers date it from the days of Cæsar; a legend taken up by Shakspeare and the poets; in favour of which the name of Cæsar's Tower remains in popular use to this very day. A Roman wall can even yet be traced near some parts of the ditch. The Tower is mentioned in the *Saxon Chronicle* in a way not incompatible with the fact of a Saxon stronghold having stood upon this spot. The buildings as we have them now in block and plan were commenced by William the Conqueror; and the series of apartments in Cæsar's Tower—hall, gallery, council-chamber, chapel—were built in the early Norman reigns, and used as a royal residence by all our Norman kings. What can Europe show to compare against such a tale? Set against the Tower of London—with its eight hundred years of historic life, its nineteen hundred years of traditional fame—all other palaces and prisons appear like things of an hour. The oldest bit of palace in Europe, that of the west front of the Burg in Vienna, is of the time of Henry the Third. The Kremlin, in Moscow, the Doge's Palazzo in Venice, are of the fourteenth century. The Seraglio in Stamboul was built by

Mohammed the Second. The oldest part of the Vatican was commenced by Borgia, whose name it bears. The old Louvre was commenced in the reign of Henry the Eighth; the Tuileries in that of Elizabeth. In the time of our civil war, Versailles was yet a swamp. Sans Souci and the Escorial belong to the eighteenth century. The Serail of Jerusalem is a Turkish edifice. The palaces of Athens, of Cairo, of Tehran, are all of modern date. Neither can the prisons which remain in fact, as well as in history and drama—with the one exception of St. Angelo in Rome,—compare against the Tower. The Bastile is gone; the Bargello has become a nuisance; the Piombi are removed from the Doge's roof. Vincennes, Spandau, Spielberg, Magdeburg, are all modern in comparison with a gaol from which Ralph Flambard escaped so long ago as the year 1100, the date of the First Crusade."

The deep interest of the subject must be our apology for the length of the following extract, on the last hour of the hapless Lady Jane Grey:—

"When she looked out upon the green, she saw the archers and lancers drawn up, and Guilford being led away from the Lieutenant's door. She now sat down and waited for her summons to depart. An hour went slowly by, and then her quick ear caught the rumble of a cart on the stones. She knew that this cart contained poor Guilford's body, and she rose to greet the corse as it passed by. Her women, who were all in tears, endeavoured to prevent her going to the window, from which she could not help seeing the block and headsman waiting for her turn; but she gently forced them aside, looked out on the cart, and made the dead youth her last adieu. Brydges and Feckenham now came for her. Her two gentlewomen could hardly walk for weeping; but Lady Jane, who was dressed in a black gown, came forth, with a prayer-book in her hand, a heavenly smile on her face, a tender light in her grey eyes. She walked modestly across the green, passed through the files of troopers, mounted the scaffold, and then, turning to the crowd of spectators, softly said:—'Good people, I am come hither to die. The fact against the Queen's highness was unlawful; but touching the procurement and desire thereof by me, or on my behalf, I wash my hands thereof, in innocency, before God, and in the face of you, good Christian people, this day.' She paused, as if to put away from her the world with which she had now done for ever. Then she added:—'I pray you all, good Christian people, to bear me witness that I die a true Christian woman, and that I look to be saved by no other than the mercy of God, in the merits of the blood of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, good people, while I am alive, I pray you to assist me with your prayers.' Kneeling down, she said to Feckenham, the only divine whom Mary would allow to come near her, 'Shall I say this Psalm?' The abbot faltered, 'Yes.' On which she repeated, in a clear voice, the noble Psalm, 'Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness; according to the multitude of Thy mercies, do away mine offences.' When she had come to the last line, she stood up on her feet, and took off her gloves and kerchief, which she

gave to Elizabeth Tylney. The Book of Psalms she gave to Thomas Brydges, the lieutenant's deputy. Then she untied her gown, and took off her bridal gear. The headsman offered to assist her, but she put his hands gently aside, and drew a white kerchief round her eyes. The veiled figure of the executioner sank at her feet, and begged her forgiveness for what he had now to do. She whispered in his ear a few soft words of pity and pardon, and then said to him openly, 'I pray you despatch me quickly.' Kneeling before the block, she felt for it blindly with her open fingers. One who stood by her touched and guided her hand to the place which it sought; when she laid down her noble head, and saying, 'Lord, into Thy hands I commend my spirit,' passed with the prayer on her lips into her everlasting rest."

**Realities of Irish Life.** By W. Stewart Trench, Land Agent in Ireland to the Marquis of Lansdowne, the Marquis of Bath, and Lord Digby; with Illustrations by his Son, J. Townsend Trench. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1869.

THIS expensive book has only been published a few months, and is already in its second edition. It is published at an opportune moment, so much attention being just now directed to Ireland, and every one being anxious to learn what are the "realities" of its case. Mr. Trench has had immense experience, and tells his stories wonderfully well. A more interesting book has seldom been published. The exhibition which it affords of the peculiarities of Irish character is singularly vivid. Some negative lessons of importance are effectually taught. Nevertheless, the grave inquirer into the causes of Irish peculiarities and the remedy for Irish evils will find less help from this volume than might have been expected. It is evident that as to all questions of radical importance, whether in politics or in political economy, Mr. Trench practises a careful reserve. No one will discover from this volume what is the precise nature of Ulster tenant-right, or what are the conditions, as between landlord and tenant, which define the position of the Irish farmer or cottier in the other provinces. The only political point which the volume may be said to determine, is that the land question is the fundamental question in Ireland. What that question really is is not shown. Perhaps, however, we may also say that there is an important moral question determined. If Mr. Trench's experience may be taken as a guide, firm, unflinching, equity—including under the sense of the word *equity* both the resolute enforcement of justice against the lawless, and also kind and generous consideration for the real needs and genuine national instincts of the people—will, in the end, bring even the Irish to order and loyalty.

**The Reformation of the Church of England: its History, Principles, and Results (A.D. 1514—1547).** By the Rev. John Henry Blunt, M.A., F.S.A., &c. Rivingtons. 1868.

MR. BLUNT does not dishonour the family-name. Like his eminent relative of the last generation, he is a thorough Anglican Churchman.

The volume before us is a partisan history, honest and outspoken, but by no means candid; painstaking in investigation, but inveterately biassed. It is, however, a valuable book, and shows all that can be said by an intelligent and well-informed Anglican partisan as to the process by which the Reformation of the English Church was effected. Wolsey is the ideal hero of the book; Cromwell is little better than a subtle scoundrel. In his estimate of Henry VIII. Mr. Blunt offers a violent contrast to the representation set forth by Mr. Froude. According to Mr. Blunt's view, all that was done by Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth in regard to the separation and reformation of the Church of England was little else than an ill-omened parenthesis, which interrupted the natural development of a reformation that would otherwise have grown in an orderly and righteous way out of the beginnings made by Wolsey and the Bishops. Nay, as a matter of fact, Mr. Blunt makes bold to deny that the Church of England, as it is, owes its actual organisation and its authoritative and effective beginning to any political decree or to any administrative action of Elizabeth or her Parliament. In truth, what Mr. Blunt is interested to establish is the lineal and legitimate descent of the actual Church of England from the Church of the times before the Reformation. In endeavouring to make his points good he is very intrepid. William Tyndale, the translator of the Bible, is, in the general esteem of Englishmen, not only a martyr, but an eminent worthy. Mr. Westcott, in his "History of the English Bible," real Churchman as he is, no less than a candid and learned investigator, has done Tyndale high honour. With Mr. Blunt, however, Tyndale is a very black sheep, a pestilent character, a presumptuous troubler of the Church and the realm. If the Church and the Bishops had only been let alone, the work of translating the Bible would have been completed with due order, and in wise and happy season and perfection. We need say no more to indicate the quality of this learned and laboured, but thoroughly one-sided volume.

**The Physiology and Pathology of the Mind.** By Henry Maudsley, M.D. Lond. London: Macmillan & Co. 1867.

DR. MAUDSLEY belongs to the physico-psychological school of Bain and Spencer. His book, however, contains the fruit of much study and experience, and, apart from the quasi-materialism which pervades it, there is much to be learnt from it. "Man," he says, and says truly, "is not only a consciously active being, but also an unconsciously active being; and, although the unconscious mutual function is, in the state of perfect bodily health, subordinated to the directing power of the will, yet, when disease has disturbed the harmony of parts, the unconscious activity displays its effects independently of the will or even of consciousness." The memory, the laws of association, the influence of hereditary bias and constitutional temperament, are among the elements which combine to make up the fund of unconscious mental power, habitude, and tendency, and to determine the character of the uncon-



scious activity of which Dr. Maudsley speaks. He distinguishes the varieties of insanity into two classes, "affective or pathetic insanity," and "ideational insanity." Under the former he includes: "1. Maniacal Reversion of the Affective Life. *Mania sine Delirio*. 2. Melancholic Depression without Delusion. *Simplex Melancholia*. 3. Moral Alienation Proper." Under "Ideational Insanity" he includes: "1. General," with "Mania and Melancholia, acute and chronic," for sub-varieties. "2. Partial," with "Monomania and Melancholia" for sub-varieties. "3. Dementia, primary and secondary." "4. General Paralysis." "5. Idiocy, including Imbecility."

"Among the cases of mental disease that have come under my care," says Dr. Maudsley, "there are some in which the cause of the outbreak has been satisfactorily traceable to religious influence injudiciously exerted. Not amongst Dissenters only, but amongst those members of the High Church party in the Church of England who are so much addicted to playing at Roman Catholicism, the most baneful effect is sometimes produced on women through the ignorant influence and misapplied zeal of priests, who mistake for deep religious feeling what is really sometimes a morbid self-feeling, arising out of an unsatisfied sexual instinct, and what is many times accompanied by hysterical excitement. . . . The Roman Catholic religion cannot, I believe, be justly charged with any such positive influence for evil on those who have been born and bred within its pale. On them its effect is rather to arrest mental development by imposing the Divine authority of the Church, and thus keeping the mind in leading-strings. But the influence of Roman Catholicism, as represented by some of the over-zealous perverts from the English Church, is in the highest degree mischievous; it is a hotbed, fostering the weaknesses of weak women, the morbid tendencies of those who are half insane, and too often the evil impulses of the vicious. It becomes the congenial refuge of those who are so afflicted with restless passions, ill-regulated feelings and selfish impulses, that they are unable to conform long to their social duties and relations, and are ever eager for change, excitement, and attention at whatever cost." The following sentences, in respect to moral insanity, will be read with interest. "When a person in good social position, possessed of the feelings that belong to a certain social state, and hitherto without reproach in all the relations of life, does, after a cause known by experience to be capable of producing every kind of insanity, suddenly undergo a great change of character, lose all good feelings, and from being truthful, temperate, and considerate, become a shameless liar, shamefully vicious, and brutally wicked, then it will certainly not be an act of charity, but an act of justice, to suspect the effects of disease. At any rate, it behoves us not to be misled in our judgment by the manifest existence in such a patient of a full knowledge of the nature of his acts, of a consciousness, in fact, of right or wrong; but to remember that disease may weaken or abolish the power of volition, without affecting consciousness."

**Speeches of the Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G., upon Subjects having relation chiefly to the Claims and Interests of the Labouring Class. With a Preface.** London: Chapman and Hall. 1868.

To the historian, the philanthropist, the statesman, the political economist, these speeches furnish matter of the highest interest. They may not live as long in literature as Mr. Bright's orations, but in their effects they have been, and still more they will be, influential for good upon the whole hereafter of this nation, perhaps beyond the collective speeches of any senator of either House now living. They mark the course of beneficent social legislation in this country during thirty years past.

**The Power of the Soul over the Body.** By George Moore, M.D. Sixth Edition. Revised and enlarged. London: Longmans. 1868.

NOTWITHSTANDING an occasional laxity and obscurity of style, the substantial merits of this volume are attested by the large and steady demand which calls for edition after edition. It is an acute, thoughtful, thoroughly well-informed, and truly Christian volume of science and philosophy, on the very interesting and important subject with which it deals.

WE will name together three volumes of *Sermons* which lie on our table. One of these is entitled, *Discourses on the Kingdom and Reign of Christ, delivered in the Chapel of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, Didsbury.* By the Rev. W. B. Pope, Theological Tutor. (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. Sold also at 66, Paternoster Row. 1869.) In this Journal it would not be befitting to do more than announce the publication of this volume, its author having for many years been closely connected with this *Review*. Another is the third edition, revised and enlarged, of *Liddon's Sermons* (Rivingtons). Of these sermons, incomparably the finest which Oxford High Churchmanship has produced—at least, since the days of Newman, and, for glow and exegetical mastery and insight, superior even to Newman's—we have spoken before in this Journal. The present edition contains three additional sermons, of quality fully equal to the rest of the volume. The poison, however, of the Wilberforceian Sacramentarianism lurks almost everywhere in the volume. Christ's human nature is the impersonal head and root of regenerate humanity, by participation of which nature in the Sacraments men are made Christians. This principle lies at the bottom of Liddon's quasi-evangelical theology. Let all his admirers bear that in mind. There is a High-Church Platonism, of which Robert Wilberforce was the great expounder, as well as a Broad-Church Platonism taught by Messrs. Maurice, Llewellyn Davies, and Kingsley. The third volume is, *Sermons*, the Rev. John Ker, Glasgow. (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.) These sermons have won rapid and deserved fame. They are in a

second edition. They are thoughtful, tender, penetrating, and most suggestive; they are fit to be placed by the side of those of Caird for chaste and self-controlled power, of Hare for insight and persuasiveness. Mr. Ker has a true realising and dramatic faculty. His sermons should be bought by those who buy Liddon's. His teaching, especially, on the Sacraments will correct the pernicious mysticism of the Oxford preacher. Nothing can be more reverent, more refined, more full of Christian sympathy and feeling, nor any teaching more free from any touch of (so-called) Catholic superstition. It is striking, we may note in passing, to observe how strict is the theological agreement at this point between the sermons of Mr. Pope and Mr. Ker.

**The Triumph of the Cross.** By Jerome Savonarola. Translated from the Latin by O'D. Travers Hill, F.R.P.S. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS translation has been made from a valuable copy, printed with all the abbreviations peculiar to Savonarola's manuscript, found in the archives of Sion College.

It is not a little remarkable that this volume, and also another of a somewhat similar kind (the *Meditations, &c.*, of Thomas à Kempis), were written by monks of the Middle Ages. In this volume there is no appeal to authority or tradition, but a rational defence of Christianity. Its style is fresh as if only written yesterday. The endeavour of the great Italian Reformer is to lead men from all dim and speculative theories to the fuller light of revealed truth, and to demonstrate the principles of a religion which, in every human breast, more or less, meets a response. In the days of Savonarola there were scoffers and doubters, as in our own day, and to these more especially he addresses himself. The Platonic discussions, which, in the fifteenth century, were conducted in the city of Florence, where Savonarola resided, were specially selected by him for attack. From the cloistered garden of St. Mark's, of which he was the preacher, he came to the onset, and immense crowds gathered to hear him. Florence was at this period—1490—said to be a second Athens; Greek philosophy was studied here—not without a large tincture of classic heathenism, both in the style of speculation, and in the tone of morals. Amid these scenes, Savonarola's warning voice was heard; and we have in this, his greatest work, the substance of these appeals.

Mr. Hill is known as the author of a volume on "English Monasticism," which contains much interesting matter, and has, on the whole, been favourably received by the public. As a translator, he has done good service to literature in bringing out this work. We learn from the preface, that, since Puritan times, there has been no English translation. The one translation which there was, moreover, was but an abridgment, and has been long lost to public knowledge. The translation is very readable, and the matter of the volume both interesting and valuable. Savonarola was a great man—a noble Italian reformer. His best work is given here.

The Captive Missionary ; Being an Account of the Country and People of Abyssinia. Embracing a Narrative of King Theodore's Life, and his Treatment of Political and Religious Missions. By the Rev. Henry Stern, Author of "Wanderings among the Falashas." Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

A Narrative of Captivity in Abyssinia ; With some Account of the late Emperor Theodore, his Country, and People. By Henry Blanc, M.D., Staff-Assistant Surgeon H.M.'s Bombay Army (lately on Special Duty in Abyssinia). Smith, Elder, and Co.

A History of the Abyssinian Expedition. By Clement R. Markham, F.S.A. With a Chapter containing an Account of the Mission and Captivity of Mr. Rassam and his Companions, by Lieut. W. F. Prideaux, Bombay Staff Corps. Macmillan and Co.

The Abyssinian Expedition. With Engravings from the *Illustrated London News*. The History by Robert Acton.

THE cost of the famous Abyssinian Expedition has startled if not absolutely frightened the new House of Commons. And, truly, it has been enormous. We do not pretend to decide, nor even at present to conjecture, how much might have been saved by a little more common sense and foresight. But the taxpayer may indulge to the full in one great consolation : this great expenditure has been incurred in a purely patriotic, benevolent, and disinterested enterprise. The world has seen for once how a Christian nation can vindicate the rights, and defend the freedom, of its representatives in a barbarous country, without inflicting a single injury on the people, or seeking a single personal advantage or acquisition.

The story told in these volumes is deeply interesting in many points of view. Mr. Stern's book, indeed, hardly fulfils the promise of its title. Had he been content with only the first title, no one could well have quarrelled with him ; but his work is in no worthy sense an account of the country and people. The details of his captivity and torments are very affecting, although the story might have been more simply and effectively told. It is curious to see how much more coolly Dr. Blanc, who pretends to nothing beyond professional knowledge, and the experience and habits of a man of the world, deals with his "bonds and imprisonment." It is only fair, however, to say that his sufferings were trifling compared with Mr. Stern's. His is a very excellent and interesting book.

The story of the expedition for the deliverance of these victims of Theodore's cruelty and barbarism is admirably told, both by Mr. Markham and Mr. Acton. Mr. Markham not only gives us a clear and

graphic account of the work and progress of Lord Napier's army, but he contributes valuable information of the geology, physical geography, fauna, flora, and human inhabitants of Abyssinia. The gorgeous volume issued from the office of the *Illustrated London News* brings the scenes described both by Mr. Acton and Mr. Markham most vividly before us, and, as a means of realising the facts of the narrative, can scarcely be too highly commended. We are promised in a few days Mr. Rassam's account of his mission to King Theodore, and we hope to bring the subject fully before our readers in our next number.

**Egypt's Record of Time to the Exodus of Israel, Critically Investigated; with a Comparative Survey of the Patriarchial History and the Chronology of Scripture, resulting in the Reconciliation of the Septuagint and Hebrew Computations, and Manetho with both.** By W. B. Galloway, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark, Regent's Park, &c. 8vo. Rivingtons. 1869.

WE are beginning to understand the chronology of the Bible, which is a considerable step towards the recognition of its veracity. The difference between the numbers in the present Hebrew text, and those found in the Septuagint, have stood in the way of its universal and unhesitating acceptance. If no such discrepancy had existed, it would have been difficult for men, however sceptically disposed, to set aside on light grounds the testimony of the oldest books in the world, records distinguished from all other true or false records by their simplicity, sobriety, and coherence, and handed down to us accompanied by an amount of external evidence unequalled in any other case. The difference in the two systems of chronology amounts to 600 years in the Antediluvian, and 700 in the Postdiluvian period up to the time of Abraham, occasioned mainly by the Hebrew making the age of sundry patriarchs a century less at the birth of their eldest sons than is found in the Septuagint reckoning. This difference has been attributed to design on the part of the Masorets, by those who prefer the Greek; and the contenders for the Hebrew verity, on the other hand, have thrown back the charge upon the Greek interpreters. Mr. Galloway gives a very simple explanation, which, it is remarkable, never occurred to the learned before. "It is the frequent practice of the Rabbins in their numerical notation, where there is a recurring unit of the larger denomination, such as a thousand or a hundred, to write only the numbers which are *over* that mark, leaving the large recurring number understood; just as we do in speaking of the year '98, or the year '68, the prefix 1700 or 1800 being fully understood, but this can only be done when it is uniform." It is remarkable, and Mr. Galloway, in a note, calls our attention to the fact, that this usage has been noticed by Dr. Hales, as common to the Rabbins (see his *Analysis of Ancient Chronology*, vol. i. p. 220, the octavo edition). This reconciliation of



the two chronologies being accomplished, we have a Bible system which must command the acceptance of every dispassionate archæologist on grounds apart from the high claims of the book in which it is found, as the most probable, and one which has a claim to be received as correct until the contrary is proved.

To examine in detail the system of chronology attributed to Manetho, and his copyists or his abbreviators, and to those who have corrupted his system, or have misunderstood it, would require a volume. Mr. Galloway thinks he has reconciled conflicting statements, and we must confess that in most cases his solutions are satisfactory, and in all cases very ingenious. Some of his conclusions contradict generally received opinions: for instance, he contends that the Israelites were actually 400 years in bondage in Egypt, and not 215 as commonly understood. He also considers the mention of the 600,000 in Exodus xii. 37 as comprising *all adults and young men and women* who were *not* children, the word which in our version is translated "men" admitting of a more general and extended meaning; and this interpretation seems to be countenanced by the fact that the sacred writer does not add, "*besides women and children*," but only "*besides children*." This reading meets one of Dr. Colenso's most plausible objections, as it reduces the number of the Israelites who came out of Egypt to about 750,000, instead of two or three millions as usually computed on the supposition that the 600,000 mentioned in Exodus xii. 37 were *adult men* only.

We do not expect a calm and dispassionate examination of this work from those who have pinned their faith on the chronologies of Bunsen, Lepsius, and others of the same learned but sceptical school. These great men, justly esteemed for their varied erudition, unhappily drew their chronological systems "out of the resources of their internal consciousness," and then fancied they found confirmation in vague interpretations of Egyptian monuments in all cases where any resemblance, however remote, could be found to some name in Manetho's catalogues. Although Bunsen and Lepsius differed in their calculations not only by hundreds but even by thousands of years, they agreed in setting aside the Biblical chronology, and this was one claim to the faith of a certain class of our half-educated literati. What Sir George Cornwall Lewis's biting criticism could not accomplish, we do not suppose our author can succeed in doing. He could not provoke them to meet him fairly in the literary arena; neither will Mr. Galloway, whose evident piety and earnest zeal will point him out as a fit object for the ridicule of those who have not the learning requisite in order to understand his arguments. We have no great faith in the reconciliation of Manetho with himself or with Scripture; and liken all controversy on such matters to a battle in the dark. The use of Mr. Galloway's book is to prove that we can fight and hold our own in such conflicts, and that our adversaries are likely, even on their own ground, to come off "second best." Mr. Galloway's work deserves to be read and studied by all Biblical and archæological inquirers.



**The Institutions of Christianity, Exhibited in their Scriptural Character and Practical Bearing.** By Thomas Jackson. London : Wesleyan Conference Office. 1868.

THERE are no books so interesting, none, we think, so precious to read, as those of the old and wise who retain the freshness and buoyancy of youth. Such a volume is before us. Here are represented the results of more than fifty years' most diligent reading, and close, coherent thought. The author, after a fair introduction to the pungent experience of a Methodist itinerant preacher, was for many years employed as the "Conference" Editor, and for about as many as Theological Tutor at one of the Colleges of his Connexion. Altogether, in such sedulous literary and student work as these offices imply, especially when held by such a man, he spent nearer forty than thirty years of his life. And since he retired from office he has continued to study and  
ite.

In this book the wisdom of centuries bygone is brought down to the present moment. Jerome and Professor Lightfoot are both represented here with the intermediate Fathers, Puritans, Cavaliers, Nonconformists, and Methodists. The most important subjects are discussed—"the Institutions of Christianity"—the Sabbath, the offices of Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist, Pastor and Teacher, and Deacon, the Sacraments, and the Church. Those who wish to see a ripe and learned Methodist book of unquestionable authority, bearing on these subjects, must refer to this volume in preference to any other. Not indeed that the book has any official authority : but that it represents what Mr. Jackson taught for many years as theological tutor at a Methodist college, and expresses, with only slight and mostly individual exceptions, the doctrinal views which prevail in his church.

Reading of extraordinary range, excellent sense, sound doctrine, and a capital style, combine to make this volume one of sterling value. To Churchmen desiring to understand the ecclesiastical views of Methodists, we particularly commend it.

**A Political Survey.** By Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, Member for the Elgin District of Burghs ; Author of "Studies in European Politics," &c. &c. Edinburgh : Edmonston and Douglas. 1868.

THERE is little hazard in saying that as to foreign nations and foreign politics Mr. Grant Duff is the best informed man in England. There is nothing more notable than the "crass ignorance" of the average Englishman respecting the real facts and questions which lie at the bottom of the complications and controversies which make up the tangled web of continental politics. Mr. Grant Duff is perfectly at home in the maze which to most of us is so unintelligible ; he seems to be familiar with every winding of the labyrinth. Nor is it only continental nations, races, governments and politics that he has studied

and mastered. He is thoroughly well informed as to American questions, whether of the Northern or the Southern continent. He is a trustworthy guide on Asiatic questions; Turkey, Persia, Central Asia, the relations of Russia with Interior Central Asia, and of England in Asia with Russia; India, China, Japan, Siam; are all set in a clear light before the eyes of his reader. Nor does he leave out of view such yet more unfamiliar ground as has been usually held apart as the region of the Cushite races: Nejed, Egypt, Abyssinia, Zanzibar, Madagascar, Western Africa, Morocco, Tunis, Tripoli, all have a place in his comprehensive survey. Mr. Duff has made foreign politics a special study for many years: and, fortunately, his style and handling are as able, easy, and compendiously clear and adequate, as his knowledge is extensive and complete. We cannot but strongly recommend his admirable epitome to our readers, of whatever class. It should be placed by the side of the *Statesman's Year-Book* on the shelves of every intelligent Englishman; not only the politician, but the critic, the publicist, the preacher and missionary speaker, and, as much as any class, the merchant and manufacturer, will find his account in making himself master of such works as these. If all had known as much as Mr. Duff, England would have been saved from some grievous and losing mistakes in policy, the club classes from fatally misdirected sympathies, and the commercial classes from blind bewilderment, and often from fatal mistakes, in speculation.

**Brothers-in-Law.** In Three Volumes. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1869.

No wonder that the reputation of the modern fiction sinks lower and lower. Scott and Edgeworth, Bulwer and Thackeray (when at their best), Miss Austin in a former generation, and Miss Mulock in the present; Dickens, notwithstanding his exaggeration and caricature; and Trollope, with other and secondary names,—had succeeded in redeeming the prose fiction from the just reprobation which a century of wild and loose romancing and play-writing, of coarse and lewd novel-writing, had brought upon fiction in general, when the recent school of sensational and dissolute novel-writing after the pattern of the worst French school, came in to bring back the bad name which had almost passed out of memory. And yet parables, stories, fictions, in verse and in prose, for old and for young, are, in some sort, a natural necessity. Fiction might be as true as honest biography; fiction has often been truer than some well-reputed and even edifying biographies. Under these circumstances, it is very desirable that those who, for themselves or others, desire to know of sound and wholesome works of fiction, should have an opportunity of gaining such knowledge. For this reason we directed attention three months ago to a thoroughly healthy and Christian work of fiction; and for the same reason we have pleasure in singling out for commendation the work named at the head of this note. It is the writer's first book, and it is to be hoped it will not be her last. It has already won golden opinions from critics

of very opposite schools, who all agree as to its high intellectual and moral character. There is no touch of sensationalism. All is modest, thoughtful, and redolent of high culture, refined feeling, and Christian principle. The writing is careful and thoroughly good. Life is shown as it is; whatever is overstrained or unreal, is finely reproved by the evolution of the story; manly truth, and a sober, practical view of duty, are inculcated. A Christian tone pervades the whole. Our space will not allow us to attempt any analysis of the volumes; but, for those who must have such recreation as a wholesome story may afford, we can conscientiously recommend them. And we do so certainly with none the less cordiality because the writer has at various times instructed the readers of this Journal on subjects of high historical and moral interest.

We need only announce the publication of a second edition of Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Essays on Criticism* (Macmillans), a work on which chiefly, as yet, we venture to think that Mr. Arnold's reputation as a writer must rest. Mr. Arnold has a rare combination of qualities to fit him for the work of light yet searching criticism. Under a veil of half-cynical scepticism may be detected in him deep tenderness and real pathos. He is keen, airy, cultivated, and widely sympathetic, and is a master of terse and graceful style. His defect is, that lacking, on some deep matters, the repose and confidence of conviction, he lacks, as a consequence, practical earnestness of purpose. There is a certain half-*blasé* tone, speaking morally and intellectually, not socially, about some of his writing, and he seems to have breathed somewhat too much the enervating air of the literary club. In short, he is nothing, if not fastidious. In a critic, however, fastidiousness may be said to be natural, however unsuitable such a quality might be in the leader of a party.

The *Second Volume* of the *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley* (Wesleyan Conference Office) has been issued. It contains *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns* (1741), and *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1742). To have these matchless lyrics thus republished from the originals, and in their original form—all complete to the very title-page—is a great boon indeed. In this volume are many of the finest of the Wesley hymns—such as "The Woman of Canaan," "The Good Samaritan," "Wrestling Jacob," "Let me die with the Philistines;"—and a number of his wonderful "funeral hymns." The Wesley hymns at last are beginning to be appreciated throughout all churches, and even in Scotland itself. We have no doubt the demand for this republication will increase as the series unfolds.

*Dean Alford's Greek Testament, with English Notes.* (Intended for the Upper Forms of Schools, and for Pass-men at the Universities.) Abridged by Bradley H. Alford, M.A., Vicar of Leavenheath, Colchester, late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Rivingtons, and Deighton, Bell and Co. 1869.) The title sufficiently explains what the volume is. We must add that the abridgment appears to be

judiciously executed; and that the type, both of the Greek text and of the notes, is excellent. It is a convenient and valuable edition of the Greek Testament for ordinary academic use, and for textual reference.

AN abridged edition of the *Memoirs of Baron Bunsen* (Longmans), has been brought out in two beautiful volumes. "The special aim held in view has been so to shorten the original work that no one of the many aspects of Bunsen's life and character should be lost sight of, and that, in fact, the shorter biography should convey as much knowledge of him as would be acquired from the larger volumes." Of the memoirs themselves we spoke at some length on their first appearance. In their present form they cannot fail to have a very extensive circulation. No library should be without them. At the same time all should remember in what a school of heresy Bunsen graduated, however accomplished he was, and however noble and beautiful was his character, and into what lamentable excesses of Rationalism he advanced.

The Relations of John Wesley and of Wesleyan Methodism to the Church of England, Investigated and Determined. By James H. Rigg, D.D., Author of "Modern Anglican Theology," "Essays for the Times," &c. London: Longmans. 1868.

"WHAT is now published in this form," as Dr. Rigg's preface states, "is, with very few variations, a republication of an article contributed to the *London Quarterly Review* for July last." "It is thus republished," adds the author, "in compliance with the pressing request of many Methodists, ministers and laymen, including some of the most distinguished men in Methodism, and of those who have been appointed to the most responsible offices; and it may be regarded by Churchmen as expressing the views of Methodists generally." The only addition of any importance made to the pamphlet, in its present form, is, in fact, the preface now prefixed, from which we may be allowed to quote some of the closing sentences. "It must always be remembered that, even in Wesley's days, his societies included not a few strict Dissenters; even among his preachers there was a sprinkling of such: and, besides the strict Dissenters, there were among the 'people called Methodists' multitudes, probably a majority, at least during the last thirty years of Wesley's life, who, while they had no idea of becoming political Dissenters, had an antipathy to the services of the parish church, and preferred to be 'friendly at a' great 'distance.' Altogether the change which has taken place in the sentiments of the Methodists towards the Church of England is much less considerable than most persons suppose. Some eminent Methodists from generation to generation, among the rest Adam Clarke, have been very warmly attached to the Church of England, and have strongly expressed their attachment. There are still at the present day some remaining who are strong friends of the

Church of England. But the general attitude of the 'Connexion' is that of independence without enmity.

"Wesley's injunction to his people was to be 'the friends of all, the enemies of none.' That motto is not yet forgotten. Nor did the last Conference in the least depart from Wesley's maxim . . . by courteously declining to take into consideration a letter, emanating from one who is equally eminent as a man of saintly character, and as an able and dangerous heresiarch, the consideration of which would have been a departure from that rule of ecclesiastico-political non-interference on which the Conference has acted from the beginning."

Dr. Rigg has graced his republication with a dedication to the Rev. William Arthur, lately one of the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, now Principal of the Methodist College, Belfast. We quote the final sentence of the Dedication:—"Knowing, therefore, as I do, that the views which are set forth in the following pages respecting the relations of Methodism to the Church of England agree with those which you have long held, and which, twelve years ago, you published in the *London Quarterly Review*, I wish to dedicate this publication to you, both because of our long friendship, and that I may thus gain the advantage of your name to bespeak the more attentive consideration for that which is here advanced."

#### Words of Comfort for Parents Bereaved of Little Children.

Edited by William Logan, Author of "The Moral Statistics of Glasgow," &c. Fifth Edition, Enlarged.  
London: Nisbet & Co. 1868.

MR. LOGAN by this volume, no longer now a little one, has made himself one of the best-known benefactors of his race. Not for profit's sake, but out of pure sympathy, he has compiled and edited this most beautiful and blessed book. Here are treasures of consolation, in prose and poetry, for all that are bereaved. The volume has no rival, and is one which no Christian should lack. In connection with Mr. Logan's book, we may name one by his friend, Dr. William Anderson, of Glasgow, on a cognate subject, entitled *Re-Union of Christian Friends and their Infant Children in the Heavenly Kingdom* (Oliphant, Edinburgh; Hamiltons, London). It is a volume worthy of Dr. Anderson's reputation, and of its touching subject.

**Safe Steps in Perilous Times: or, the Churches of our Country, How and Why they should be United. In Reply to the Friendly Appeals of the Clergy.** By the Rev. T. Withington. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1868.

THE spirit of this little volume is good, and its execution displays a considerable measure of ability. The *why* that pleads for a more evangelical union of sentiment and action is earnestly and faithfully



dwelt upon; but the *how* receives no fresh light from this appeal to the Churches. Taken as a whole, and apart from some hasty passages that are too lively for the subject, we think Mr. Withington's present labours calculated to promote the object he most certainly aims at—a more united spirit among the servants of the common Master in these realms.

**Apostles and False Apostles; or, Paul, not Matthias, the Twelfth Apostle.** Showing the Teaching of the New Testament concerning Apostolic Succession. By Henry Bleby, Wesleyan Missionary, West Indies. London. 1868.

THIS pamphlet is a racy and readable refutation of the hierarchical theory common to Rome and Anglicanism. But its force as an argument is altogether irrespective of the choice of Matthias, whom we believe, notwithstanding Mr. Bleby's specious pleas, to have been numbered with the Apostles by the appointment of our Lord Himself.

**A Bible Dictionary.** By the Rev. James Austin Bastow. Third Edition. London: Longmans. 1868.

INTERNAL evidence indicates that this is the work of a minister of one of the branches of the Methodist Community. It is a good book, well worthy to compete with the many productions of the same kind that have during the last few years been issued. A third edition shows the appreciation of the public, and has given the industrious and conscientious author an opportunity to bring up his dictionary to the standard of more recent investigation. We note with special satisfaction that the work includes more of the directly theological element than is usually attempted in Bible dictionaries. An able introduction to the literature of the Bible, occupying fifty-two close pages, will be found exceedingly useful by a large number of readers.

**The Election of Grace.** By the Rev. W. Taylor. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

CLEAR, homely, vigorous, and popular, like all the author's previous works. We cannot, however, accept his conclusions respecting the prescience of God, opposed as they are to catholic orthodoxy.

**Poems and Ballads.** By Janet Hamilton. Glasgow: James Maclehose.

THIS is a new edition of wonderful old Janet Hamilton's poems. Many of them are graceful and pathetic, many more vigorous, and the volume is well worth buying, because of the history of the writer, which was sketched by us when we noticed the former edition.



Centenary Celebration of Cheshunt College, June 25th, 1868.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1868.

DEAN ALFORD, an eminent divine and dignitary of the Church of England, presided at the celebration of the Centenary of "The Countess's" College. The whole of the proceedings well deserve to be recorded in a permanent form. The volume contains an Introductory Essay by the Rev. Henry Allon, Mr. Binney's Sermon, Dean Alford's Address, and the speeches at the dinner. This celebration was a pregnant sign of the times.

*Walking in the Light: A Memoir of Mrs. Hannah Baristow, of Huddersfield, Yorkshire.* By the Rev. Thornley Smith.  
London: William Tegg. 1868.

"A MEMOIR of one who occupied no very public sphere of life, but who, nevertheless, exerted an influence in the circle in which she moved of the most beneficial nature." In these modest words Mr. Smith introduces the subject of a memoir which has our unqualified commendation. The author's work is designed for the spiritual edification of his readers, and he uses material most serviceable for his purpose, with the skill and judgment of "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

*The Sunday at Home: a Family Magazine for Sabbath Reading.* 1868. London: The Religious Tract Society.  
*The Leisure Hour.* 1868. Tract Society.

THE name of the Religious Tract Society, from whose office these goodly volumes issue, is a sufficient guarantee of their purity of sentiment and catholicity of spirit; and it may be sufficient to say of them that like their predecessors they are treasuries of good counsel and instruction, that the writing is generally excellent, the illustrations capital, and they are admirably adapted for the young.

*A Guide to the Eastern Alps.* By John Ball, M.R.I.A., F.L.S., &c., late President of the Alpine Club. London: Longmans. 1868.

THIS is not one of Murray's Handbooks, but it is a volume which may claim rank with any of that famous series. It is one, the last, of three volumes which have been prepared at the instance of Messrs. Longman, to serve as complete Guide Books to the Alps. Mr. Ball has been entrusted with the preparation of the three. This volume surveys, and marks out into routes for tourists, a portion of the Alpine world which is much less known than it deserves to be, including the Suabian Alps, for visiting several sections of which Munich is the most convenient starting point, and which comprehends the dis-

tricts of Algau, Zugspitz and Kreuth; the Salzburg Alps, which include a portion of the earlier course of the Danube, and parts of which may be reached from Munich, from Innsbruck, from Salzburg, from Ems; and the Tyrolèse and Venetian Alps, the Styrian and the Carnic Alps, besides other ranges and regions of which the names are quite unknown to the general English reader. Mr. Ball, as an Alpine tourist, is a host in himself, and he has been zealously and well helped by his enthusiastic mountaineer friends; he has also availed himself of every accessible source of authentic information. The result is a standard volume, very complete and of genuine quality and authority. It is illustrated and enriched by admirable maps. The singular beauty and finish of the geological map, in particular, at the end of the volume, cannot but strike every reader. The indexes appear to be very careful and complete.

Romantic Episodes of Chivalric and Mediæval France. Now done into English by Alexander Vance. Corrected and Enlarged. Dublin: Moffat and Co. London: Hamilton and Co. 1868.

THIS volume contains extracts from Faryn, on the *Ordinance of Duels*, and the *Ceremonies Attendant on the Degradation of a Knight*; from De Bassompierre's *Memoirs*; from the *Histoire de Jehan De Saintré* (*Final Combat between Damp Abbott and the Lord De Saintré*); from Brantome's *Hommes Illustres*; from St. Pelaye's *Memoirs of Ancient Chivalry*; from the *Heptameron*; from Froissart's *Memoirs*; from the *Book of the Knight of the Tower*; from Sully, Berville, De Commynes, Montaigne, and several others. The conception of the volume is happy; the selections are piquant; the translation is well done; translation and notes taken together show Mr. Vance to be a scholarly and cultivated man. Nevertheless the volume, as a whole, does not altogether suit us. There is a subtle infection of laxity about it. There might have been more that is chaste and noble in character and influence, if another sort of selections had been interspersed. The atmosphere of ancient French gallantry clings too much to the volume.

---

*A number of valuable works stand over for notice in July. We regret that several of these did not reach us earlier.*

## BRIEF NOTES.

On our table lie several publications which we can do little more than announce. Mr. Baldwin Brown's *Misread Passages of Scripture* is one of his best books, small, wise, and suggestive. We cordially recommend it; there is depth, tenderness, and comfort in it. Hodder and Stoughton are the publishers. Number Two of the *Weigh-house Series* is *A Compressed Score Edition of Congregational Church Music*,—the *Weigh-house Service of Song*—which needs no commendation of ours,—is beautifully got up, and is published at the same house. The Christian Knowledge Society are publishing in a beautiful separate form, and at a low price, suitable for class-books in training colleges, the *Pleasures of Hope*, the *Lady of the Lake*, *Samson Agonistes*, and other poems. *Murby's Scripture Manuals* (Bouverie-street) on each of the four Gospels, the Acts, and the historical books of the Old Testament, are well known and have an established reputation. Hodder and Stoughton have added to their popular series of *Shilling School-books for Beginners*, a comprehensive and carefully prepared manual by the Rev. Theophilus Woolmer, whose book on *Child Training* we lately noticed with commendation; the title is, *First Lessons in Ancient History for Young People*. It contains an outline of the history of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Persia, Greece, and Rome, with a very complete series of chronological tables. Mr. Freeman has sent us his *Protestant Dissenter's Almanac and Political Annual for 1869*. We are sorry it was not in time for notice and commendation three months ago. It is a cheap and valuable annual. *The Miner of Perranzabuloe*, by W. D. Tyack (Elliot Stock), already known to many of our readers as an excellent and well-written memoir of a Cornish Methodist of no common order for sense and saintliness, comes to us in a second edition. The spirited and admirable series entitled *Bible Animals*, by the well-known naturalist, the Rev. J. G. Wood (Longmans), has now extended to fifteen parts. Nothing could be better in its kind than this series.

Dr. Morgan, in his *Town Life among the Poorest*, of which the price is but a shilling (Longmans), teaches truths which ought to be commonplace, but of which an immense number of well-dressed people even now seem to be strangely and discredibly ignorant, in regard to the condition of our very poor town and city neighbours. The authoress of the *Englishwoman in America* reveals still more painful facts as to the city of Edinburgh in particular, than any which Dr. Morgan has to tell of. Edinburgh is, by long odds, in its lowest portions, the foulest place in the three kingdoms; it consists of a warren of the most disgusting cells and cellars, or garrets little better than the unlighted cellars, which may be called dens or lairs, but cannot be called chambers or homes, surrounded by the worst conditions of reeking, sometimes putrid, impurity. This emphatic and sorely needed *exposé* (one of the *Odds and Ends* series) may be had of Edmonston and Douglas for sixpence or less. Once again let Dr. Guthrie and his friends haste to the rescue.

## OBITUARY.

SINCE our last issue one of our most valued contributors, a gentleman of rare accomplishments, and of still rarer moral excellence, has been removed by death. But for the complete failure of his health, it is likely that he might now have been occupying the chair at Belfast which was so long and so worthily filled by Professor McCosh. But the Rev. R. W. Monsell is no more. In our number for July last appeared his last contribution to our pages, an article on the Irish Land Question, remarkable equally for its thoroughness and its temperate and practical wisdom. But a little before he had written a paper on the Eastern Question, which attracted considerable attention, and would repay, on the part of statesmen and publicists, more careful study than it has yet received. Other papers, from the same hand, on the affairs and nationalities of Austria, of the Principalities, of Russia, and of Turkey, have at different times enriched our pages. In theology he contributed, long ago, a fine article on Thiersch. In philosophy, only last year, he wrote a profound and masterly article on Secrétan, one of the rising names on the Continent in metaphysical and moral speculation. But, most of all, he ought to be known, and will one day be known, by his noble and comprehensive volume on the *Religion of Redemption*, a volume which attests his mastery in almost every province of inquiry within the limits of philosophy and theology. Among Mr. Monsell's friends and admirers were reckoned such names as De Pressensé, Ernest Naville, Fred. De Rougemont, Charles Secrétan, and J. F. Astié. In this country he was little known, having for many years been a resident at Neufchâtel. But all who did know him, of whatever country, testified to the singular fascination of his manners and conversation, and the extraordinary sweetness and nobleness of his character. He died on the seventh of last January, in the fifty-third year of his age, leaving a widow and family to mourn his loss, whose circumstances, we lament to hear, are far from being what the friends of such a man would desire.

---